

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 691

TM 006 448

AUTHOR Sprengel, Donald P.; Toney, E. Allan.
TITLE Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Final Report and Assessment, 1972-73; Comparison of Impact of the Pilot and Experimental Years.
INSTITUTION Saint Louis Univ., Mo. Center for Urban Problems.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO DLMA-42-29-72-07-2
PUB DATE Jul 74
GRANT DL-42-29-72-07
NOTE 211p.; For related document, see TM 006 445

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Attendance; Black Students; Career Exploration; Caucasian Students; Compensatory Education Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Dropout Prevention; Employment Counselors; High School Students; Industry; Job Placement; Longitudinal Studies; Manpower Development; On the Job Training; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Spanish Speaking; *Vocational Counseling; Vocational Education; *Work Experience Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Neighborhood Youth Corps; *Vocational Exploration in Private Sector Program

ABSTRACT

This final report on the second experimental year of the Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS-II) program presents an assessment of program operations, administration and impact. VEPS was designed as a training and vocational exploration program for in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) enrollees who were probable dropouts. The main departure from the regular NYC program was that VEPS enrollees were placed at private sector work stations and received intensive counseling. NYC programs paid one-half of enrollee wages. Information was obtained on 716 enrollees in eleven cities which were intensively monitored. Ninety and one-tenths percent of the enrollees remained in school or graduated; 53.9% completed the full year program. Academic records for enrollees who completed the program indicate that 62.0% improved their grade point average from the previous year. Forty-eight and eight-tenths percent of the enrollees missed fewer school days during VEPS-II than the previous year. Among 179 seniors who completed VEPS, 71.5% continued their employment, 9.5% continued their education and 4.5% joined the military, 10.6% were not working after graduation, and 2.8% were married. (Author)

VOCATIONAL EXPLORATION IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR:
FINAL REPORT AND ASSESSMENT 1972-73;
COMPARISON OF IMPACT OF THE PILOT
AND SECOND EXPERIMENTAL YEARS

Prepared by: Donald P. Sprengel and
E. Allan Tomey

Participating Faculty and Staff:
John T. Manns
Phyllis J. Reser.
Wiley C. Smith
George D. Wendel

Submitted by: Center for Urban Programs
Saint Louis University
221 N. Grand Blvd.
Saint Louis, Missouri 63103

July, 1974

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under Grant No. 42-29-72-07 pursuant to the provisions of Title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the content of this report.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET		1. Report No. DIMA 42-29-72-07-2	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Final Report and Assessment, 1972-73; Comparison of Impact of the Pilot and Second Experimental Years				5. Report Date July, 1974	
7. Author(s) Donald P. Sprengel and E. Allan Tomey				8. Performing Organization Rpt. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Center for Urban Programs Saint Louis University 221 N. Grand St. Louis, Missouri 63103				10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
				11. Contract/Grant No. DL 42-29-72-07	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration Office of Research and Development 1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20210				13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
				14.	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstracts This final report on the second experimental year of the Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS-II) program presents an assessment of program operations, administration and impact. VEPS was designed as a training and vocational exploration program for in-school NYC enrollees who were "probable dropouts." The main departure from the regular NYC program was that VEPS enrollees were placed at private sector work stations and received intensive counseling. NYC programs paid one-half of enrollee wages. Information was obtained on 716 enrollees in eleven cities which were intensively monitored. 90.1% of the enrollees remained in school or graduated; 53.9% completed the full year program. Academic records for enrollees who completed the program indicate that 62.0% improved their grade point average from the previous year. 48.8% of the enrollees missed fewer school days during VEPS-II than the previous year. Among 179 seniors who completed VEPS, 71.5% continued their employment, 9.5% continued their education and 4.5% joined the military, 10.6% were not working after graduation, and 2.8% were married.					
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors Counseling - vocational interests Education (including training) Employment Manpower Orientation (training) Placement Schools Vocational guidance					
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) NYC Experimental Program Youth - on-the-job training Dropout prevention					
17c. COSATI Field/Group					
18. Availability Statement Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.				19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	
				20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	
				21. No. of Pages	
				22. Price	

PREFACE

For the past two years, the U.S. Department of Labor has experimented in the development and demonstration of a vocational exploration and work training program for Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school youth at private sector worksites. The program, Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS), provided for the selection of 16 year-old probable high school drop-outs and their placement in the private sector over a summer and subsequent school year; enrollees were to receive coordinated year-round counseling, orientation to the world of work, career exploration, on-the-job training, and work experience.

The Center for Urban Programs (CUP) at Saint Louis University completed a contract with the Department of Labor to monitor-analyze the 1971-72 pilot experimental year operations, and in that capacity CUP prepared both a model with implementation suggestions for operating the second year VEPS program and a final report and assessment of impact of the first year program. Under terms of a grant, the Center for Urban Programs monitored the second year of VEPS, and this document represents the final report and assessment of the second year VEPS operations; included are measures of programmatic impact upon second year year enrollees and comparisons with impact measures from the pilot experimental year.

While the principal investigators accept responsibility for the final product, a number of individuals contributed to the effort. The entire staff of the Center for Urban Programs, especially Dr. George D. Wendel, Director, Terry Manns, Phyllis Reser, and Wiley Smith must be mentioned. Mr. Joseph Seiler, Miss Louise Scott, and Mr. Thomas Bruening of the Division of Experimental Operations Research, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Department of Labor, were of great assistance in the monitoring and analysis function. Within the Division of Work Experience of the Manpower Administration, Mrs. Wendy Leake provided essential support in facilitating and expediting the monitoring component. In the course of the research effort, CUP personnel came in contact with NYC and Department of Labor personnel in twenty cities from coast to coast. While this report focuses on only a small number of those cities, we would be unjust not to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation given us in this endeavor by local VEPS personnel in all of those cities. We would especially like to acknowledge the cooperation and, indeed tolerance, that was shown us by the NYC directors and VEPS staff in those cities whose activities were closely monitored. Without that help, our task would have been made impossible. Finally, for any errors of judgment or interpretation, the principal investigators assume total responsibility.

Saint Louis, Missouri
July, 1974

Donald P. Sprengel
E. Allan Tomey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
List of Tables	v
Part I. Summary of Findings	1
Part II. Introduction to VEPS	9
A. Description of the Experimental VEPS Program	9
B. Program Objectives of VEPS	15
C. The Role of the Center for Urban Programs in VEPS	15
D. Research Methodology	17
E. Preliminary Assessment of VEPS-II and Recommendations for National Implementation	20
F. Postscript: VEPS and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act	25
Part III. Assessment of Program Operations and Administration	27
A. Administration and Staffing	29
B. Enrollee Selection	31
C. Job Development	33
D. Pre-Job Orientation	36
E. On-Going Counseling	37
F. Career Exploration	39
Part IV. Assessment of Programmatic Impact on Enrollees	41
A. Profile of the VEPS Enrollees	42
B. Work Experience of VEPS Enrollees	46
C. General Assessment of Programmatic Impact	52
C.1. Impact on Dropout Rate	52
C.2. Impact on Academic Performance	54
C.3. Impact on Attendance in School	56
C.4. Improved Disciplinary Status	58
C.5. Continued Part-Time Private Sector Employment	60
C.6. Facilitated the Transition from School to the Work Force	62
C.7. NYC and School System Personnel Opinions of VEPS	63
D. Analysis of Completers and Terminators	63
E. Reasons for Terminating VEPS	79
F. School Dropouts and VEPS	80
Part V. VEPS City Summaries	83
Cleveland, Ohio	84
Colorado Springs, Colorado	90
Eugene, Oregon	94
Flint, Michigan	99

Fort Worth, Texas	104
Georgetown, Texas	107
Las Vegas, Nevada	111
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	114
Pueblo, Colorado	119
Salt Lake City, Utah	123
San Bernardino, California	127
Appendix A. Field Memorandum 183-71	133
Appendix B. Field Memorandum 195-72	142
Appendix C. Field Memorandum 255-73	151
Appendix D. Tables	155
Appendix E. Number of Youth Engaged in Various Work Experiences	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table II-1.	Comprehensive List of NYC Programs Ever Authorized to Conduct VEPS-II Programs, By Status as of November 30, 1972 .	14
Table 1.	Pre-Program Grades and Attendance	32
Table 2.	Selected Enrollee Characteristics, By City and Total	43
Table 3.	Pre-Program Mean Grade Point Averages and Days Absent for VEPS Enrollees, By City	45
Table 4.	Size of VEPS Employers (Number of Full Time Employees), By City	47
Table 5.	Categorical Distribution of VEPS Occupational Experiences, By City	49
Table 6.	Number of VEPS Work Experiences for Enrollees, By City	51
Table 7.	Summary Disposition of VEPS Enrollees, By City	53
Table 8.	Mean Grade Point Averages for 1971-72 and 1972-73, By City	55
Table 9.	Direction and Degree of Grade Point Change for Completers, By City	57
Table 10.	Direction and Degree of Attendance Change for VEPS Completers, By City	59
Table 11.	Final Disposition of VEPS Completers, By City	61
Table 12.	Selected Demographic Characteristics of the VEPS Universe, Completers, and Terminators	64
Table 13.	Selected Family Characteristics of the VEPS Universe, Completers, and Terminators	66
Table 14.	Employment History Characteristics of the VEPS Universe, Completers, and Terminators	68
Table 15.	VEPS Work Experience for the VEPS Universe, Completers, and Terminators	69
Table 16.	Academic Impact Data on the VEPS Universe, Completers, and Terminators	71
Table 17.	Direction of G.P.A. Change by Demographic Characteristics for VEPS Universe and Completers	73

Table 18.	Direction of G.P.A. Change by VEPS Work Experience for VEPS Universe and Completers	75
Table 19.	Direction of Attendance Change by Demographic Characteristics for VEPS Universe and Completers	76
Table 20.	Direction of Attendance Change by VEPS Work Experience for VEPS Universe and Completers	77
Table 21.	Reasons Given for Termination of VEPS Enrollees, By City	78

APPENDIX

Table D-1	Selected Family Characteristics, By City and Total	
Table D-2	Selected Employment History Characteristics of VEPS Enrollees, By City	
Table D-3	Mean School Days Absent for 1971-72 and 1972-73, By City	
Table D-4	Selected Demographic Characteristics of VEPS Completers, By City	
Table D-5	Selected Family Characteristics of VEPS Completers, By City	
Table D-6	Selected Employment History Characteristics of VEPS Completers, By City	
Table D-7	Characteristics of VEPS Work Experience of Completers, By City	
Table D-8	Selected Demographic Characteristics of VEPS Terminators, By City	
Table D-9	Selected Family Characteristics of VEPS Terminations, By City	
Table D-10	Selected Employment History Characteristics of VEPS Terminators, By City	
Table D-11	Characteristics of VEPS Work Experience of Terminators, By City	
Table D-12	Academic Indicators of VEPS Terminators, By City	
Table D-13	Reasons Given for Termination of VEPS Enrollees, By Size of VEPS Employer	
Table D-14	Reasons Given for Terminations of VEPS Enrollees, By Type of VEPS Work Experience	

Table D-15 Selected Demographic Characteristics of VEPS Dropouts,
By City

Table D-16 Selected Family Characteristics of VEPS Dropouts,
By City

Table D-17 Selected Employment History Characteristics of VEPS
Dropouts, By City

PART I

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The second year Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS-II) program was designed to provide training and career exploration for sixteen year old in-school NYC enrollees who were "probable dropouts." The main departure from the regular NYC program was that VEPS enrollees were placed at private sector work stations and received intensive personal, career, and academic counseling. NYC programs shared the wage costs of enrollees with the private sector employers.

The major findings of the Center for Urban Programs (CUP) monitoring teams are presented below. The findings under Assessment of Program Operations and Administration are detailed in Part III of this report, while those under Assessment of Program Impact on Enrollees comprise Part IV.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Administration and Staffing

- a. The change which placed all program functions under the VEPS-II program sponsored by the NYC program worked well.
- b. VEPS-II programs generally did not have to develop staff specialization in an area such as job development.
- c. Several VEPS-II programs were operated by one person who performed all the required tasks.
- d. Programs in rural counties found it necessary to assign VEPS enrollees to their regular in-school NYC counselors.

2. Enrollee Selection

- a. VEPS-II enrollees met the NYC income guideline.
- b. Most enrollees were at least sixteen years of age.
- c. The enrollees had a number of academic, personal and family problems, but were generally not selected according to a rigorous definition of probable dropout.
- d. Most enrollees were not enrolled in the school's regular work experience or vocational training program.
- e. Comparisons between cities must be qualified with the knowledge that the enrollees varied in terms of previous academic performance.

3. Job Development

- a. Direct job development by the VEPS-II staff worked well.
- b. Smaller employers continued to provide the majority of training stations for VEPS.
- c. The simplified wage cost sharing feature in VEPS-II was useful in recruiting employers, although not as great an attraction as initially thought.
- d. The training stations covered a wide range of occupations.
- e. Programs in rural areas benefited from the access to private sector training through VEPS-II.

4. Pre-Job Orientation

- a. Pre-job orientation programs continued to be limited in some cities due to the start-up problems involved in new programs.
- b. The majority of VEPS-II programs concentrated the pre-job sessions on developing proper world-of-work attitudes.
- c. Programs staffed by one or two persons had more difficulty due to efforts in job development.
- d. Enrollees benefited from outside speakers, role playing, practice on application forms, films, and tape cassettes.
- e. The program flexibility to use a maximum of sixty hours was used by only a few cities.

5. On-Going Counseling

- a. VEPS-II program counselors conducted this phase well.
- b. Enrollees had a number of job-related problems as well as academic, personal and family problems.
- c. Counselors were able to intercede successfully with employers in a number of on-the-job problem cases.
- d. Enrollees who were several grades behind their age group presented the most severe academic problems.
- e. The increased enrollee-to-counselor ratio (1:30) did not present any general difficulty. Where VEPS-II was operated by one person, the counselor was occasionally overloaded.

6. Career Exploration

- a. This program component continued to be the most difficult to implement.
- b. Most cities conducted some type of vocational and career exploration sessions, but most found it necessary to modify the bi-weekly time schedule.
- c. Smaller programs often used the schools or other agencies to present some career exploration material.
- d. Most VEPS-II programs used some sessions to reinforce the work attitudes gained in the pre-job orientation sessions.
- e. The main problems encountered were the difficulty of getting groups of enrollees together and of scheduling the times with employers.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM IMPACT ON ENROLLEES

Information is based upon data for the universe of 716 enrollees in eleven intensively monitored cities. For some items N is less than 716.

1. Profile of VEPS Enrollees

- a. Sex: Male 52.1%; Female 47.9%.
- b. Age: 15 or younger 15.4%; 16 - 37.9%; 17 or older 46.7%.
- c. Ethnic Background: Black 45.0%; White 33.3%; Spanish surname 20.8%; other 0.8%.
- d. Year in School (during VEPS): Sophomore or less 11.2%; Junior 40.0%; Senior 48.7%.
- e. Ever Worked: Yes 74.6%; No 25.4%.
- f. Worked thirty days or more: Yes 66.5%; No 33.6%.
- g. Pre-program Mean Grade Point Average:

Mean	1.98	(All Cities)
Highest	2.73	(Las Vegas)
Lowest	1.39	(Pittsburgh)

- h. Pre-program Mean Days Absent:

Mean	22.9	(All Cities)
Highest	35.0	(Pittsburgh)
Lowest	8.0	(Colorado Springs)

2. Work Experience in VEPS

- a. Type of Occupational Exposure

Professional	1.0%
Managerial	0.0%
Sales	11.1%
Clerical	27.6%

Craftsmen	6.5%
Operative	19.0%
Laborer	13.9%
Service	20.7%

b. Size of VEPS Employers (Number of full-time employees)

1-4	23.7%
5-9	21.1%
10-19	22.3%
20-29	11.1%
30-49	7.7%
50-99	4.0%
100 or more	10.0%

c. Number of VEPS Work Experiences: One 69.2%; Two 25.9%; Three or more 4.9%.

3. General Assessment of Programmatic Impact

a. Impact on School Dropout Rate

(1) Remained in school or graduated 90.1%; dropped out of high school 9.9%.

(2) Completed VEPS 53.9%; terminated 46.0%.

b. Impact on Academic Performance

Academic averages were available for 346 completers.

(1) Enrollee grade point averages improved from the previous school year (1971-/2) in eight of ten cities. (No data was available from Eugene, Oregon).

(2) Improved G.P.A. 62.0%; declined 32.0%; unchanged 6.0%.

(3) Mean grade point changes ranged from +0.62 in Cleveland to -0.14 in Fort Worth

(4) The distribution of G.P.A. change by degree:

+1.26 or more	8.9%
+0.76 to +1.25	14.4%
+0.26 to +0.75	23.4%
+0.25 to -0.25	29.4%
-0.26 to -0.75	13.5%
-0.76 to -1.25	7.8%
-1.26 or more	2.6%

c. Impact on School Attendance

- (1) The mean number of days absent declined in five of the ten cities. (No data was available from Eugene, Oregon). Two cities in which absences increased did so only marginally (one day).
- (2) Fewer school days absent 48.8%; more days absent 44.7%; unchanged 6.5%.
- (3) The distribution of Attendance Change by degree (+ = improvement).

+10 days or more	18.8%
+4 to +9	15.3%
+3 to -3	32.8%
-4 to -9	14.3%
-10 days or more	18.8%

d. Improved Disciplinary Status.

- (1) Available information indicates that enrollees had significantly fewer incidents with school authorities and the police than in previous years.

e. Continued Part-Time Private Sector Employment

- (1) A significant number of VEPS completers remained in the private sector, 69.0% at the VEPS employer and 6.3% at other private worksites.
- (2) Disposition of remaining VEPS completers

Returned to NYC	5.5%
Higher Education	6.0%
Not working	8.4%
Military	2.4%
Other	2.4%

f. Facilitated the Transition from School to the Work Force

- (1) Of the 179 youth who were seniors and completed the program and graduated, over half (59.2%) retained their VEPS job, another 8.4% found other private sector employment, and 3.9% found public sector employment for a total of 71.5% employed full-time after VEPS.
- (2) 9.5% went on to higher education and 4.5% joined the military.
- (3) Enrollees who were working, continuing their education or in the military accounted for 85.5% of the completers who graduated.

- (4) Only 10.6% were not working and another 2.8% were married. The disposition of 1.1% was unknown.

g. NYC and School System Personnel Opinions of VEPS

- (1) NYC directors were enthusiastic about the potential that VEPS provided.
- (2) Particularly important was the availability through VEPS of more varied worksites and exposure to private sector employers.
- (3) Some programs found VEPS a much needed addition to NYC where public sector jobs outside schools are in short supply.

4. Analysis of Completers and Terminators

- a. Completed VEPS 53.9% (386); Terminated 46.0% (330).
- b. Males completed VEPS at a higher rate, 55.2%, than females, 52.8%.
- c. Enrollees seventeen years of age or older completed at a higher rate, 56.5%; than youth sixteen, 53.9%, or under sixteen, 46.8%.
- d. Completion rates by ethnic backgrounds were: Blacks, 60.6%; Whites, 50.0%; Spanish surnames, 47.0%.
- e. VEPS enrollees in their junior year completed the program at 49.6% rate; those in less than the junior year, 51.3%; seniors 59.0%.
- f. Only minor demographic and family differences existed between completers and terminators.
- g. Neither the size of the VEPS employer nor the VEPS occupational experience had any major impact on program completion rates.
- h. Completers improved their academic averages more frequently, 62.0%, than did terminators, 50.8%.
- i. Improvement in school attendance patterns was shown by 48.8% of completers and 46.2% of the terminators.
- j. Comparison of the academic averages of completers and the universe, controlled for age and grade in school, shows that completers improved their grade point averages more often than did all VEPS enrollees.
- k. In the same comparison using school attendance data, the relationship is not as strong.
- l. No direct relationship exists between academic improvement or positive changes in school attendance and the type of VEPS work experience or the size of VEPS employer.

5. Reasons for Terminating VEPS

- a. Terminations from VEPS amounted to 46.0% (330 of the 716 youth).
- b. The main reasons for terminating were dropping out of school, 21.6%; quitting, laid off or fired, 23.4%.
- c. Taking other private sector employment was the reason for termination in 10.3% of the cases; not interested in 7.9% and conflict with school activities in 5.2%.
- d. No other reason accounted for as much as five percent of the cases.
- e. Over half the enrollees completed the program in four of the eleven cities; in another four cities, the completion rate was between 40% and 50%.
- f. No pattern emerged from an analysis of reasons for termination when compared with size of employer or type of VEPS work experience.
- g. The limited academic information available on terminators indicated that they did not improve in either grades or attendance as much as VEPS completers.

6. School Dropouts and VEPS

- a. Seventy-one, 9.9% of the 716 VEPS enrollees, dropped out of school during the 1972-73 program year.
- b. The VEPS dropout rate is comparable to findings of other studies of youth in this age and school year bracket even though the youth selected as VEPS enrollees generally were probable dropouts.

PART II

INTRODUCTION TO VEPS

As outlined in U.S. Department of Labor Field Memorandum 195-72* (May 12, 1972), the Department of Labor authorized a one year extension of the pilot Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) program; the purpose of the extension was further experimentation with program content and implementation. The second experimental year was coterminous with the 1972-73 NYC summer and in-school phases.

A. Description of the Experimental VEPS Program.

VEPS-II (as the second year of experimental implementation is hereafter identified) differed in several significant ways from VEPS-I (first-year). These differences are attributable to the experience gained in the implementation of VEPS-I. For background and comparative purposes, the description of the VEPS-I program is given below.

A.1. The VEPS-I Experimental Program. As described in Field Memorandum No. 183-71,** the VEPS-I program was designed for eleventh grade, 16 year old Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school youth who could be identified as probable dropouts. Originally, fourteen cities were targeted for VEPS programs, but four sites were unable to start programs. Two cities -- Columbus, Georgia and Portland, Oregon -- terminated VEPS-I after the summer phase. The cities that completed the program were: Columbus, Ohio; Flint, Michigan; Fort Worth, Texas; Lawrence and Haverhill, Massachusetts; Norfolk, Virginia; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Salt Lake City, Utah; and San Bernardino, California. Developed by the U.S. Department of Labor and the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB), joined by the U.S. Office of Education of HEW, the program provided career exploration and training opportunities that, hopefully, would result in reduction of high school dropouts and the flow of untrained, unskilled youth into the labor market. Primary emphasis was to be given to the development of training and career exploration opportunities in order to provide enrollees with the widest possible exposure to the world of work. Training assignments were to be related directly to the interests and capabilities of enrollees in concert with their educational goals.

The major components of VEPS were as follows:

(1) Counseling and Remediation. This component was to provide enrollees with the motivation and basic educational skills needed to

*See Appendix B.

**See Appendix A.

function effectively in a work environment. Remedial needs were to be determined and assistance rendered. Counseling assistance was to be provided at work, in school, and at home.

(2) Orientation. This component was to provide enrollees with a basic grasp of the demands placed on the individual in the world of work, work attitudes and habits, an awareness of the participating company's business and company facilities, and an explication of the enrollees' primary objectives while in the program and the company's interest in the program.

(3) Career Exploration. This component was to provide enrollees the opportunity to broaden their perception of the panorama of jobs in the world of work, to observe others in a work environment, to discuss with permanent employees the training and education needed for job success, to understand the rewards arising from employment, and to learn of the possibilities of upward mobility in a given skill.

(4) Non-Productive On-The-Job Training. This component involved close supervision of youth enrollees as they developed work habits and basic job skills and the application of those learned skills in the actual work environment. This component was entirely non-productive on-the-job training at private sector worksites.

(5) Productive Work Experience. This program component provided actual work experience in production of marketable goods and services with wages paid entirely by the employer (see details below concerning "Employer Phase").

The first four components listed above represented program activities conducted when wages were paid to enrollees from NYC sponsor funds -- referred to hereafter as "NYC Phase." The fifth component constituted the "Employer Phase" with wages paid entirely by the private sector. The full year VEPS program had three segments (summer, first school semester, and second school semester), each of which had a "NYC Phase" and an "Employer Phase" during the weeks designated below.

<u>Segment</u>	<u>NYC Phase</u>	<u>Employer Phase</u>
<u>Summer</u>		
12 weeks (39 hours per week)	Weeks 1-6	Weeks 7-12
<u>First School Semester</u>		
19 weeks (15 hours per week)	Weeks 1-15	Weeks 16-19
<u>Second School Semester</u>		
19 weeks (15 hours per week)	Weeks 1-10	Weeks 11-19

At the start of each segment, the enrollee was to move to a new work station at his present or another employer. At the conclusion of the program each enrollee was to have had three separate VEPS work experiences.

Youth participants in the VEPS program were to be recruited by NYC sponsors; potential enrollees were to be in-school youth at least 16 years of age who were economically disadvantaged as defined by NYC guidelines. Candidates were to be referred to special high school counselors for certification that the students would be 11th graders in September 1971 and that they were "probable dropouts."

The special high school counselors assigned to the program were funded by the U.S. Office of Education. Counselors were to be selected for their interest in aiding the disadvantaged rather than objective counseling credentials, except where State regulations or union agreements required fully credentialed counselors. They were to devote full time to the enrollee's remediation, counseling, and career exploration needs and interests. A counselor-enrollee ratio of 1:20 was to be maintained wherever possible. Counselors would contact and observe enrollees at their private sector work-sites and at their schools (during school year), and would assist NYC sponsors and companies in developing and operating several program components.

Work sites for enrollees were to be identified and selected by NAB metro offices; criteria for participating private sector companies included a demonstrated interest in training and employing in-school youth, and a capability of effectively training new personnel. The program was to be designed so as to provide each enrollee three separate and distinct work experiences either within the same company or in different companies over the course of one year. As conditions for participating in the program, a company was to agree to the following:

- (1) Provide, at its own cost, necessary staff, space, equipment, supplies and access to the principal worksites;
- (2) Make these resources available to enrollees and high school counselors; and
- (3) Absorb the salaries of enrollees when each "NYC Phase" terminated.

Additional responsibilities of private sector participants under terms of the program included: (a) identification of training and employment positions; (b) development of orientation and career exploration curricula with local NYC and school officials; (c) allocation of supervisory personnel to training and work with enrollees; (d) development of procedures governing payrolls during training periods where the employer bears the full cost of the enrollee's salary; (e) designation of a company coordinator to assist the NYC sponsor and high school counselor in developing program curriculums and schedules.

In addition to the recruitment and referral of youth function, NYC sponsors were responsible for program administration including record keeping, paying NYC wages to enrollees, maintaining liaison with company coordinators and high school counselors, working with the metro NAB youth director to provide for joint monitoring, and establishing a program review committee.

A.2. Transition to and Structure of the VEPS-II Program. Partially on the basis of a preliminary assessment paper delivered to D.O.L. on January 27, 1972, the VEPS program was authorized to continue into a second action year. This decision was in agreement with the conclusion of the CUP monitoring team that VEPS was a significant, meaningful, and successful extension of the NYC basic concept and that the program should be refined and retested in a second year.

The conclusion of the CUP monitoring team that a VEPS-II program should be continued with modifications was based upon two general categories of information: quantifiable evidence of programmatic impact as revealed in enrollee records, and the observations and opinions of program administrators. The data available at that early stage in the VEPS-I program was neither complete nor comprehensive, but the experiences in the eight intensively studied cities were sufficiently similar to isolate certain trends by January of 1972:

1. Reduced tendency to drop out from school among VEPS enrollees comparable to regular in-school NYC youth.
2. Improved academic achievement for VEPS enrollees.
3. Improved school attendance patterns.
4. Improved disciplinary status.
5. Evidence that the VEPS program had provided realistic attitude development and growth in individual responsibility.
6. Private sector skill development for youth not normally participants in work-experience programs.
7. Enthusiastic support for the VEPS program among VEPS personnel.

Implementation of the VEPS-I guidelines differed considerably among the eight cities completing the experimental program. A brief itemization of the major areas of programmatic variation is useful here in order to demonstrate the need for the guideline revisions implemented for the second VEPS program year beginning in the summer of 1972.

1. Local offices of NAB represented a broad range of effectiveness, tactics, and involvement. Generally, NAB was unable to develop work stations among larger employers. Several NAB offices provided little more than verbal support, while others invested substantial staff time and effort.
2. NYC offices, while providing the overhead and administrative services as well as referral of NYC youth as potential VEPS recruits, experienced a new dimension in youth employment activities. Cooperation with NAB and the schools was generally good.
3. VEPS-I enrollees were not limited to 16-year old rising juniors as called for in the guidelines and the potential dropout criterion was not rigorously implemented.

4. Counseling, exploration, and remediation programs varied in extent, content, design, hardware, and rapport with enrollees.

Given the experimental thrust of the VEPS-I program, these observed differences provided an opportunity to determine the impact of varying program designs and to assess comparatively the effectiveness of these designs.

In the assessment paper prepared by CUP (January 27, 1972), suggested program guidelines for the VEPS-II year were specified. With minor modifications these suggested guidelines were adopted by the Manpower Administration. It should be noted that the main thrust of VEPS-I toward reducing the dropout rate and improving the employability of youth was maintained in the revised program. Enrollees in the revised program were placed in the private sector as they were in VEPS-I.

In brief, the major changes in the revised program model are listed below. The rationale for these revisions may be found in the assessment paper dated January 27, 1972, and the guidelines themselves may be found in Field Memorandum No. 195-72 (May 12, 1972).*

1. Program administration was centralized with the NYC sponsor which employed the program team.

2. Job development was the responsibility of the program team; the assistance of NAB metro offices was sought, but sole reliance on NAB for job development was discouraged.

3. Operationalization of the "probable dropout" criterion was made more rigorous.

4. Work stations were to be sought among smaller employers since these appeared to provide more variety in work experiences and fostered closer supervision of the youth while at work.

5. Except for a 60 hour orientation program, private sector employers shared the cost of enrollee wages on a 50-50 basis with NYC, including time spent in counseling and career exploration.

6. The counseling, remediation, and career exploration component was given greater emphasis; a bi-weekly average of four hours was devoted for these purposes.

7. The counselor-enrollee ratio was increased to approximately 1:30⁰ from 1:20.

*See Appendix B. The guidelines and implementation model may be found in Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Model for Implementing the 1972-73 Guidelines. Saint Louis University: Center for Urban Programs, 1972.

Field Memorandum 195-72 specified that the nine cities that operated VEPS-I programs were authorized to continue into the VEPS-II program year; these cities were located in Regions I, III, V, VI, VIII, and IX; RMAs in these regions were authorized to offer the VEPS-II program to one additional city. In Regions II, IV, VII, and X, the RMAs were authorized to offer the program to two cities. The final selection process underwent considerable flux as the program year went by. This fluctuation was due to several factors, primarily the inability of programs to structure a delivery system that incorporated the basic program model. In addition, the uncertainty about NYC funding levels and the future of NYC generally had a dampening effect on agencies as they considered the implementation of a new program. Table I-1 provides a comprehensive overview of the operating programs as of November 30, 1972.

TABLE II-1

Comprehensive List of NYC Programs Ever Authorized to
Conduct VEPS-II Programs, By Status As of November 30, 1972

Albuquerque, New Mexico	Never started a VEPS program
Buffalo, New York	Conducted a summer program only
Cleveland, Ohio	In operation
Colorado Springs, Colorado	In operation
Columbus, Ohio	In operation
Davenport, Iowa	Began operation in February, 1973
Eugene, Oregon	In operation
Flint, Michigan	In operation
Fort Worth, Texas	In operation
Georgetown, Texas	In operation
Haverhill, Massachusetts	In operation
Las Vegas, Nevada	In operation
Lawrence, Massachusetts	In operation
Leon, Iowa	Recently authorized; status unknown
Marin County, California	Never started a VEPS program
Minneapolis, Minnesota	Recently authorized out-of-school program
Newark, New Jersey	In operation
Newport News, Virginia	In operation
Norfolk, Virginia	In operation
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	In operation
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Recently authorized
Portland, Oregon	Recently authorized
Providence, Rhode Island	Recently authorized
Pueblo, Colorado	In operation
Salem, Oregon	Recently authorized
Salt Lake City, Utah	In operation
San Bernardino, California	In operation

CUP monitoring teams conducted intensive on-site studies in twelve cities operating VEPS-II programs. These cities were Flint (Michigan), Fort Worth (Texas), Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Salt Lake City, and San

Bernardino (all of which operated VEPS-I programs) and in Cleveland, Colorado Springs, Eugene, Georgetown, Las Vegas, Newark, and Pueblo (all of which were new to the VEPS program). In addition, technical assistance visitations at the request of regional DOL personnel were made to Minneapolis (for a NYC-II program) and Davenport, Iowa.

B. Program Objectives of VEPS.

The program objectives of the VEPS-I and VEPS-II programs are comparable to those of the regular NYC in-school program. Briefly stated, these objectives are:

(1) To provide youth with the incentive to remain in school and earn a high school diploma -- The VEPS project was designed for probable high school dropouts. The incentive to remain in school was to be provided by intensive counseling, remediation, and work experience components that would demonstrate the need for and value of education.

(2) To facilitate the smooth transition upon high school graduation into the full-time work force -- Utilizing private sector work sites with three separate work experiences, coupled with career exploration, the VEPS program sought to provide a broader and more transferable NYC work experience by using private rather than public sector work sites.

(3) To provide youth with part-time employment while in school -- A major objective of VEPS was for employers to continue employing enrollees on a full-time basis during the summer following the initial program year and on a part-time basis during the enrollees' high school senior year. Upon graduation, it was hoped that the enrollees would be employed by the participating company as a regular full-time employee or by another employer seeking labor skills possessed by the enrollees.

(4) To dramatize the need for and utility of a sound high school education for success in the world of work -- Through example, experience, and counseling it was hoped that enrollees could draw linkages between the opportunities provided in formal education with the requirements for employability in the private sector.

C. The Role of the Center for Urban Programs in VEPS.

From June 15, 1971, to December, 1972, the Center for Urban Programs (CUP) was under contract (Number 82-29-71-34) to the U.S. Department of Labor to monitor-analyze the experimental Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) program. Under terms of the contract CUP had the following general responsibilities:

(1) Compared and documented alternative approaches for establishing and operating the several program components.

(2) Provided periodic feedback to the Department of Labor regarding program operations and problems.

(3) Analyzed the broad first year VEPS-I experience to (a) assess whether there were outcomes which might support continuing VEPS in a second year, and (b) developed an improved VEPS design and guideline for use in Summer 1972 and thereafter.

(4) Assessed the impact of VEPS-I on the participating youth and agencies.

CUP monitored the VEPS-I program and collected enrollee impact data in eight of the nine participating cities. Periodic reports were submitted to the Division of Experimental Operations Research of the Department of Labor on September 15, October 22, and December 20, 1971. An assessment report was delivered on January 27, 1972, which contained a preliminary assessment of impact on VEPS enrollees and recommended guidelines for a second program year. A program model and guide for program implementation in 1972-73 was prepared in February, 1972, and was distributed in early May (Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Model for Implementing the 1972-73 Guidelines) to assist those programs beginning in the Summer, 1972 for the VEPS II program.

Since June 1, 1972, CUP has continued its monitoring and assessment activities under terms of a grant pursuant to the provisions of Title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended (Grant No. 42-29-72-07). CUP responsibilities under terms of the grant were both intensified and broadened. These responsibilities included:

(1) Comparison and documentation of alternative patterns of VEPS-II implementation in selected cities which had operated VEPS-I programs and four to six new VEPS-II cities;

(2) Assessment of impact of the VEPS-II program upon enrollees and agencies;

(3) Long range assessment of the impact of VEPS-I upon enrollees and comparison of vocational experiences of VEPS-I youth and control groups subsequent to their twelfth grade school year;

(4) Development of a revised program model and suggested guidelines for national implementation of VEPS should programmatic outcomes support continuation of the program; and

(5) Preparation of a conference for VEPS program personnel, employers and DOL representatives to provide information exchange and feedback for needed program revision.

Periodic progress reports were submitted to the Department of Labor regarding on-going VEPS-II operations on August 21, 1972, and on April 30, 1973. An interim report on the VEPS-I impact study was submitted on May 25, 1973. A preliminary assessment of progress and recommended guidelines for

the national implementation of VEPS was submitted on May 10, 1973. The conference was held in Saint Louis on November 1-3, 1972, and the proceedings of that conference were distributed on December 10, 1972. The revised program model and guide to implementation was prepared but distribution was deferred pending Congressional action on manpower revenue sharing.

D. Research Methodology.

The contractual obligations of the Center for Urban Programs under its monitor-analysis function involved three separate, but interrelated, tasks: update and corrective-suggestive feedback to the national and regional offices of the Department of Labor as the VEPS-II program year progressed; development of an operational model including recommended guidelines and optional organizational arrangements preparatory to national implementation; and assessment of the impact of VEPS-II upon enrollees and operating programs. The data and information for these three purposes involved a mixture of three methodological approaches; since the monitor-analysis function does not incorporate programmatic evaluation, the utilization of impressionistic and observational information is more extensively involved than would ordinarily be expected. Since the nature of the questions to be answered dictated the specific mix of methodologies, multiple approaches were utilized, not all of which involved quantitative techniques. Wherever possible, quantifiable information was gathered, but in terms of the feedback and model construction activities, the use of quantified data was supplementary to observational, attitudinal, and impressionistic information.

To meet these diverse tasks, four data sources provided the bulk of the required information to formulate the model, structure recommended guidelines, prepare progress reports, and assess impact upon VEPS enrollees: on-site observation including work station visits; personal interviews with program personnel, enrollees, and private sector employers; NYC data forms; and academic records of enrollees.

(1) On-Site Observation -- Observational methodology permitted development of the basic orientation to the VEPS program as it operated in each particularized situation and provided a "feel" for the local setting in which to assess impact data. While in many ways intangible and non-quantifiable, observation was the only efficient and economical tool to monitor program components and to construct an operational map for the required model.

Of those cities authorized to conduct VEPS-II programs by November 30, 1972, seventeen operated year long experiments; these cities are Cleveland, Colorado Springs, Columbus, Eugene, Flint, Fort Worth, Georgetown, Haverhill, Las Vegas, Lawrence, Newark, Newport News, Norfolk, Pittsburgh, Pueblo, Salt Lake City, and San Bernardino. One city, Buffalo, ran a summer only program. At least one field visit was conducted to each of these cities, regardless of whether they were chosen for inclusion in the monitoring effort. Site visits were facilitated due to close geographical proximity and did not require excessive travel and time allocations for CUP staff. In addition site visits were made to Albuquerque, Minneapolis, and Davenport. In the final selection process, cities were chosen for intensive monitoring and assessment on the basis of several criteria: unusual organizational

structures, number of planned enrollees, number of participating private sector companies, size of the city, evidence of unusual interagency interaction, the demographic/economic profile of the city, and impressions gained from initial visitations to all cities. Ultimately, five cities which had conducted VEPS-I programs were selected (Fort Worth, Salt Lake City, Flint, Pittsburgh, and San Bernardino) and six cities which had conducted VEPS-II programs only (Georgetown, Colorado Springs, Cleveland, Eugene, Las Vegas, and Pueblo). Georgetown and Eugene were chosen specifically due to their rural character and broad geographic area.

The national office of the Department of Labor was provided with site visitation schedules to keep them abreast of the field operations. At the outset contact was usually initiated with the field representative of the Department of Labor for the city concerned. Subsequently, field visits were arranged through VEPS program personnel. Telephone communication was universally employed to arrange field visits. Normally, each field visit was undertaken by a two man team and its usual duration was two to three work days, although the length of the visit depended upon the information needs at the time.

Over the course of the program, five field visits were scheduled to each of the participating cities. In certain instances additional site visits were made in order to collect additional information, or at the request of the Labor Department or program personnel. In some cases fewer than five visits were made.

The field visits were planned as follows:

June-July, 1972 -- Initial site visits to those cities who had begun VEPS-II to develop a contact system, introduce the monitoring team, gather preliminary information, and select cities for intensive study.

October-November, 1972 -- The second visit was to monitor the transition from the summer to the first semester in-school phase and the beginning of the career exploration component and to gather data to make a preliminary assessment of impact trends.

February-March, 1973 -- The third visit was to document in-school procedures and operations and gather all required information not previously ascertained to assist in the development of the program model and monitor the transition to the second semester.

May-June, 1973 -- The fourth visit was to monitor second semester activities and to establish reporting systems for the impact analysis at the conclusion of the second semester.

June-July, 1973 -- The final field visit was to amplify or clarify all prior information on enrollees, gather academic impact data, and determine the disposition of the enrollee following the program year.

The format for the field visits was fairly standard throughout the monitoring effort. A general session with all interested parties was held at the outset of each visit. At this session organizational arrangements and administrative procedures were discussed and documented; problems of implementation were discussed and remedial steps were suggested. The monitoring team then discussed individual program components with the person most directly involved--job development with the VEPS-II job developer;

administration with the project coordinator; counseling and career exploration with the counseling staff; etc. Lists of enrollees were obtained, and pertinent information on each was then gathered. Arrangements were also made for the collection of academic data on the enrollees. Once discussions and information needs were completed, the monitoring team then undertook to make a number of work station visits to talk with youth and employers; occasionally, double duty was attained by having the monitoring team split, each monitor going with one counselor to a number of job sites.

(2) Personal Interviews -- The interview situation should be interpreted broadly. Primarily the format was informal discussion with largely unstructured interview schedules. A checklist of questions to be asked to meet the various informational requirements was used on the field visits. The monitoring team found it necessary at times to emphasize that their role was not one of evaluation but of monitoring, that interest in failures or mistakes was due to a desire to prevent such occurrences in other cities and to note them in the implementation model. Discussions with youth and employers were undertaken at the work station, and their views and ideas were solicited. In effect, the monitoring team attempted to open dialogues with program personnel, youth, and employers in order to gain an accurate impression of programmatic activities and potential. No structured interview sessions were used, although the same topics were covered. Such sessions were valuable in providing anecdotal information and in enriching the perspective of the monitoring team for the task of model building.

(3) NYC Data Forms -- The primary source for enrollee demographic information was the NYC-16 intake form. Such forms were gathered from operating programs for every youth who was enrolled in VEPS. Changes in the reporting forms for NYC (from a NYC-16 to a MA-101 or other form) seriously complicated the collection of needed demographic data in a number of cities. Since enrollees did not, at the time of registration, provide comparable information to that of the VEPS-I enrollees, it became necessary for CUP monitoring teams to devise other routines for gaining this information. Usually the counselor was asked to obtain this information, and CUP provided a listing of data needs on each enrollee using the NYC-16 form as a model. While staff in most cities cooperated with this effort, inevitably some youth (especially those who terminated the program) were overlooked and no data was obtained; in other cities, VEPS staff did not respond to the request for this help in data collection, and CUP teams then examined individual enrollee records to extract whatever information could be obtained. Despite the best efforts of CUP monitoring teams, sizable data gaps appear in the demographic analysis which follows. Termination data (occasionally the use of MA-102 forms) was usually obtained from the VEPS counselors. Normal procedure called for a review of the list of enrollees in order to determine the place of employment, the types of experiences received, termination reasons, and such other information as might bear upon the youth's performance in the VEPS program. The monitoring team in most cases experienced no difficulty in obtaining information from program personnel.

(4) Academic Indicators -- Early in the visitation schedule, the monitoring team requested academic attendance and grade performance indicators for the year preceding the VEPS-II year for each of the enrollees. This data was to serve as baseline information for an assessment of impact. Generally, VEPS personnel provided this information with little hesitance, but in several

cases this information was never obtained or required repeated requests. The problem was minimized where school systems were the NYC sponsors, but where NYC was sponsored by the CAP agency or the city, occasional questions were raised as to confidentiality and access. In some cases, no academic data was released to the CUP teams.

Early in the monitoring effort, the decision was reached not to conduct any universe-wide structured interviews with enrollees. A number of factors were involved in this decision. First, approval of the Office of Management and Budget constituted a restricting time factor. Second, prior experience with such interviews had generally questioned both reliability and validity. Third, the types of information sought (largely attitudinal change factors) were extremely difficult to isolate and even more difficult to scale for the instrumentation. Given these problems, the monitoring team decided to rely on counselors' observations and statements by employers buttressed by change in academic indicators.

Interim reports to the Department of Labor included general observations for all participating cities organized by topical area, summaries of programmatic operations in individual cities, and copies of field notes written by the monitoring teams. Additional information in the way of forms, curriculum outlines, work station and job descriptions were included with the field notes. The progress reports and the supplemental information provided the base for the preparation of the model and recommended guidelines for continuation of the program. The initial assessment of program trends was based on preliminary evidence from academic indicators and other data obtained through field visits.

NYC-16 data, academic indicators, employment data, work experience and other information including final disposition and reasons for termination were coded and transferred to punch cards. These data were run on a CDC 3300 using two canned programs: DATA SORT for the preparation of marginal frequencies and data "clean-up" and NUCROS for the preparation of cross tabulations and statistical routines. Work experience code descriptions were taken from the Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations -- 1970 Census of Population (Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1971). Academic performance and attendance data for enrollees was standardized to fit a 4.0 grade point scale and to fit equivalent school days absent.

E. Preliminary Assessment of VEPS-II and Recommendations for National Implementation.

CUP staff prepared a preliminary assessment of VEPS-II program operations for the Department of Labor, which was delivered on May 10, 1973. This report contained an overview of the impact of VEPS-I, the preliminary findings on VEPS-II, an assessment of the impact of guideline changes in VEPS-II, and recommendations for national implementation of the VEPS program. Partly on the basis of that report, the Department of Labor issued Field Memorandum 255-73 (August 24, 1973)* authorizing placement of both in-school

*See Appendix C.

and out-of-school NYC youth in private sector worksites. This authorization was based on Manpower Administration Order 8-73 and involved amendment of the Code of Federal Regulations. However, decision on these amendments was precluded by Congressional action on the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, and the VEPS authorization was held in abeyance.

The assessment paper did not discern any marked variation in impact on enrollees from the VEPS-I program, although the data were preliminary and sketchy. For national implementation, however, several marked changes from VEPS-II were recommended. These recommendations were summarized under seven topical headings dealing with the substantive changes that had been made in moving from VEPS-I to VEPS-II.

The following discussion itemized these seven major guideline changes. Each item is followed by observations on their implementation during VEPS-II and suggestions for modification in a nationally authorized program.

1. Program administration was centralized with the NYC sponsor which employed the program team. The original concept had relied on a high degree of cooperation and integration among the participating groups. In most cities, the desired cooperation did not develop and, in some areas, competition between agencies hampered the program. Concentration of administrative functions with the NYC sponsor and the assignment of a program team to handle VEPS was aimed at giving proper responsibility to the group with the most experience in working with NYC enrollees. The program team concept is flexible, depending on local conditions.

VEPS programs outside larger urban areas usually provided one staff person who was responsible for all phases of the program. In some cases, NYC counselors merely assumed the additional duties of operating VEPS. Only the larger programs employed a staff of several persons; however, even where several staff people were available, they usually did not specialize in a VEPS component, such as job development or vocational exploration.

There were several reasons why so little specialization took place. First, counselors who worked with all aspects of the program felt more confident about placing students. They knew the students and their limitations and were familiar with the employer's expectations. Second, counselors who actually developed the training stations felt they had better access to the work site in order to make counseling contacts. Third, the VEPS programs were limited in enrollee size and consequently the staffs were never larger than six. It may be that significantly larger staffs would result in the need for more specialization.

Funding a program team presented problems in the second year. Cities funded VEPS counselors using carry-over Office of Education funds from VEPS-I, small supplemental grants from the Department of Labor, regular NYC allocations and outside sources such as the Public Employment Program. Several programs operating VEPS attempted to obtain funding from general revenue-sharing through the appropriate Mayor or other local elected official. The need for counselors who provide the program services is obvious. Many of their functions such as job development could not be delegated to other groups without eliminating the program as it has operated for two years.

2. Job development was the responsibility of the program team; the assistance of the NAB metro office and other groups was to be sought. In most VEPS-I cities, NAB did little to promote private sector participation in the program. Where NAB did work for VEPS, lack of staff and an emphasis on working with large employers reduced their job development effectiveness. With job development primarily assigned to the program team, NAB and other groups could be used to provide publicity for VEPS and for initial access to employers.

The formal change in the job development function for VEPS-II reduced the uncertainty that surrounded the first year of VEPS. The counselors knew from the start that they would be developing the training sites for the enrollees. This approach worked well in almost all cities. The advantages in terms of knowing employer expectations, working conditions, and establishing rapport for later access in the counseling program were mentioned above.

The counselors generally responded well to the challenge of obtaining training positions in the private sector. As in the first year, most of the counselors had previously worked only with public sector employers in the NYC program. In most instances, the counselors felt that developing jobs in the private sector was more demanding than placing NYC enrollees. However, other factors, such as the requirement that the private sector employers pay a portion of the wages, hampered VEPS job development compared to NYC.

CUP recommended that job development continue to be a function of the counselors working in VEPS.

3. Operationalization of the "probable dropout" criterion was made more rigorous. In some programs, the only criterion utilized was that of the OEO poverty guidelines; no real effort was made to select "probable dropouts" by specific criteria, such as academic achievement, attendance, disciplinary actions, and so forth. In some programs, there was deliberate avoidance of enrollees with serious academic or personal problems (in effect, "creaming" enrollees) to assure programmatic success. Since the counseling component had the potential to reach youth with serious problems (and to ensure proper evaluation of the program in this respect), CUP recommended that a definite and concerted effort to recruit such enrollees be made.

Almost all programs in the second year made some attempt to include "probable dropouts." The selection criteria varied widely but usually included as a minimum some recommendation by summer NYC counselors. Few cities made selections based on extremely rigorous criteria in any organized manner. But, the enrollees participating in VEPS are not usually enrolled in a regular school program in either vocational education or career development; thus a clientele group having a vocational education need was reached.

CUP recommended that programs be urged to continue to select students who are not now participating in school programs in vocational or career education. Generally, efforts should be made to work with students who are not doing superior academic work. By so doing the program maximized the benefits from the VEPS counselors and the relatively low enrollee-to-counselor ratio.

Insofar as out-of-school NYC enrollees are concerned, if VEPS is adapted to out-of-school programs, the probable dropout criterion will already have been met. In general, the recommendation was for eligibility to be based on the needs of the enrollees and the benefits each would obtain.

The experience in the first year of VEPS was that students who were failing all their subjects were generally poor risks for VEPS. In other words, they were too far behind their classmates in school and had been away from the classroom setting too often to be motivated toward school attendance by just obtaining a job.

Due to state and Federal labor legislation and typical insurance provisions, VEPS enrollees should be at least 16 years old. Whether to select Juniors or Seniors has been the subject of considerable debate by program sponsors. One side suggests that Seniors who have a part-time job are in a better position to obtain full-time employment after high school graduation. The other side suggests that Seniors are not very likely to be "probable dropouts" and that efforts should be directed to working with Juniors or even Sophomores who are behind their peers in school credits. CUP believes that both these positions have merit and that the program goals of dropout prevention and transition to full-time employment are not entirely compatible.

CUP recommended that the decision on enrolling juniors or seniors be decided by program sponsors. This procedure would allow variations depending on the local labor market and school programming. As noted above, the selection of "probable dropouts" is more difficult. It was recommended that programs weigh the student's academic and personal problems in selecting students who would benefit from VEPS.

4. Work stations were to be sought among smaller employers. It was the observation of the CUP monitoring teams that VEPS programs were more successful when they utilized smaller employers who would provide a wider range of job experiences, closer supervision of the enrollees, and greater interpersonal contact. In many cases, the owner of the establishment actually provided the supervision and took a personal interest in the enrollees.

The variety of work experiences was felt to be of prime importance in broadening the enrollees' limited knowledge of opportunities for employment upon completion of high school. It was noted that many of the target population had no experience on which to base a career selection.

Also of interest, small employers were more receptive to the program than larger employers who envisioned VEPS as requiring excessive "red tape." Union restrictions also hampered the placement of enrollees with some larger employers.

CUP recommended that programs continue to develop training positions with smaller employers. However, job developers should select only those employers who are willing to devote the necessary time to training and supervising the student. Additionally, participating employers should permit enrollees to learn a range of activities even if they are in one position during their program experience.

5. Except for the first sixty hours devoted to orientation and beginning vocational exploration, private sector employers shared the cost of enrollee wages on a fifty-fifty basis with NYC. This charge eliminated the difficulties generated under VEPS-I guidelines which called for cost-sharing based on various phases of each of three segments that made up VEPS-I. The phasing procedure was found inoperable in many situations due to the late start, and too confusing in areas which attempted to follow guidelines closely. Many first year programs turned to a constant percentage sharing (about sixty percent NYC and forty percent private sector) which was maintained throughout the pilot year.

In recognition of the fact that enrollees would be engaged in some productive work as their training progressed, CUP recommended a fifty-fifty cost ratio for all hours once the youth was placed on the job site after the sixty hour orientation. This split also recognized that the youth would have a disproportionate incidence of problems and would require an increased supervisory load for the employer. Employers would also share the cost of the four hour average bi-weekly counseling sessions when the enrollee would not be at the job site.

The cost sharing feature has been the key to obtaining private sector participation in VEPS. This incentive is essential since school programs have a number of students, many with specific training who are doing well academically that they are trying to place in part-time employment. Employers pay the student's wages, but there are no program limits on the work he can perform. Therefore, cost-sharing has been an incentive which provided access to training for VEPS enrollees who are students outside the school's regular programs, with limited skills, and mediocre academic records.

CUP recommended that the cost-sharing be retained on the same basis, fifty percent employer and fifty percent program. While it may be possible to operate a program similar to VEPS with employers paying all enrollee wages and the program only providing counselors, the success of such a limited program would depend largely on the type of students selected. VEPS program experience suggests that placements could be made, but that employers would be less willing to work with any enrollee problems before terminating them. If students without problems were selected, the program could make more placements, but the program concept would have been significantly altered. Therefore, the cost sharing arrangements should be included if at all possible.

6. The counseling, remediation and career exploration component was given greater emphasis. This component further differentiated VEPS from other youth training programs and was the area in which the program had great potential for benefiting the target population of probable dropouts. This type of enrollee was shown to have little access to and little success in work experience programs lacking a strong counseling component. The vocational exploration sessions coupled with the work training provided the impetus for the probable dropout to reconsider the value of school and academic training.

VEPS-II programs maintained a high level of counseling contacts. Remediation was handled on an individual basis in most areas. The implementation of career exploration continued to vary considerably between cities.

CUP recommended that these three areas continue to receive their present emphasis. Career exploration should be stressed using either special meetings or by enrolling the youth in appropriate school classes. The actual methods for achieving the emphasis should be left up to the local program sponsor.

One aspect of career exploration that needed further attention was the requirement in the first two program years that VEPS enrollees move to different job assignments either in the same companies or different companies. CUP recommended that this formal requirement be eliminated. This recommendation is based on several factors. First, the smaller owner managed employers that have been receptive to VEPS and provided close enrollee supervision and support often do not have many distinct job positions or titles. Second, enrollees are involved in various tasks and work experiences even if they are only in one position. For example, the duties of an office assistant in an insurance brokers office might include filing, typing, answering the phone, posting billings, typing policies, verifying statements and other office chores. Thus, the exposure to the actual world of work offered by one position can be quite broad. Third, enrollees who like what they are learning should not be forced to accept another position just to satisfy a program guideline. Finally, although sponsors in the first year did not usually require that enrollees move to new training positions, slightly under half (46.7%) of the enrollees were placed in at least two positions during the first program year.

7. The counselor-enrollee ratio was increased to 1:30 from 1:20. Experience with VEPS-I indicated that even with the responsibilities required for VEPS, an experienced full-time counselor can adequately carry a counseling load of thirty to forty enrollees. This guideline reduced the administrative cost factor, but due to limited DOL funding many programs still had problems maintaining an adequate staff.

This guideline change was followed in VEPS-II programs. Counselors generally believe that thirty to forty enrollees would be a maximum in a program which provides the counseling and supportive services called for in the VEPS design. No firm ratio can ever be "correct" for all situations. However, unless the enrollees are substantially different from those enrolled during the first two years, counselors would probably not be able to work with more than forty youth. Even this number would require a certain amount of phasing-in during job development and placement.

F. Postscript: VEPS and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

In anticipation of national implementation of the VEPS program, guidelines based on CUP recommendations were prepared in Field Memorandum 255-73, but VEPS also required major modifications in the Code of Federal Regulations. These changes were under consideration simultaneously with Congressional debate on the President's proposed manpower revenue sharing package. Due to the apparent imminence of passage, action on the Code changes was delayed pending final Congressional disposition.

The suggested guidelines (Field Memorandum 255-73) reflected two basic themes. First, the guidelines imposed were minimal. This reflected the

decentralization effort of the Department of Labor and provided the regional offices with substantial discretion in what additional guidelines would be operable in the region. Second, the Field Memorandum incorporated a substantial adoption of the basic recommendations made by CUP. Cost sharing was maintained; de-emphasis on probable dropouts was adopted; counseling and career exploration packages were encouraged; and cooperation among the schools, the National Alliance of Businessmen, and NYC programs was to be encouraged.

The major amplification on the CUP recommendations occurred in two categories. First, cost sharing was based on the wages received by the enrollee; thus, if an enrollee were to earn more than the minimum wage, NYC would share that cost and not \$0.80 per hour. Second, greater emphasis was given to rotation in work experiences. After 500 hours at a worksite, the enrollee was to be rotated to another work training experience. After 1000 hours with one employer, the enrollee must be either picked up entirely by the employer or be placed with another employer.

These proposed guidelines for national implementation of VEPS reflected a basic thrust of the program--a flexible structure designed to give maximum latitude to operating personnel in meeting the work training needs of NYC enrollees. The ultimate success of an individual program depends on the calibre and dedication of NYC staffs entirely; programmatic guidelines were designed deliberately for minimal restraint on the ability of program personnel to respond to individual places and enrollees. It was hoped that this thrust of adaptability and flexibility would be maintained in any future VEPS program.

In late 1973, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Guidelines for implementing CETA appeared in the Federal Register on Tuesday, March 19, 1974 (Volume 39, Number 54). Specific provisions within these regulations appear to exclude the possibility of implementing a VEPS-type program. Section 95.33 (d) 2 (ii) reads in part: "Direct subsidization of wages for participants employed by private employers organized for profit is not an allowable expenditure." This prohibition relates to on-the-job training. In Section 95.33 (d) 3 (ii) relating to work experience, the following is applicable: "Work experience in the private for profit sector is prohibited."

While the possibility remains that changes may be made in the regulations to permit VEPS operations, at present VEPS as presently constituted does not appear to be an option open to youth work experience programs. Prime sponsors might, however, explore the possibilities of implementing a VEPS program under on-the-job-training provisions.

PART III

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

The second year VEPS program expanded the number of cities participating in the experimental area of NYC enrollee placement in the private sector. The principle program features retained from the first year guidelines were the use of private sector worksites for training stations and the selection of enrollees who were probable high school dropouts. The major changes from VEPS-I were that NYC would be the sole program sponsor, that there would be an equal cost-sharing split between employers and NYC for all enrollee wages after any pre-job orientation program, and that the responsibility for job development would be assigned to the VEPS-II program team. Since Department of Labor regional offices were given a great deal of discretion in working with local VEPS sponsors to initiate VEPS-II or smooth the transition from VEPS-I to VEPS-II, each participating program sponsor modified some of the less important aspects of the program guidelines. Generally, this flexibility allowed the program guidelines to be applicable in a wide range of situations from large metropolitan areas to clusters of rural counties.

A total of twenty cities operated some portion of the VEPS-II program. This number includes Buffalo, New York, which only operated a summer component, and Minneapolis, Minnesota which began an out-of-school VEPS program in early 1973. Other cities were authorized to implement a VEPS-II program, but never followed through. In some cases their decision was influenced by the freeze placed on manpower programs in late 1972.

Although all nine first year VEPS programs continued into VEPS-II, several did so without a strong commitment to upgrading the program operation. Others made a more concerted effort to strengthen weak components and, in some cases, expand the number of enrollees. All first year cities found that the lack of Office of Education funding for counselors was a major problem.

With the exception of Cleveland and Newark, the eleven new cities which participated in VEPS-II were medium to small in size. Programs in Georgetown, Texas and Eugene, Oregon covered a multi-county area and were essentially rural in character. There was a wide diversity in population size and make-up of the VEPS-II cities, and as with VEPS-I, all sections of the country were represented.

The diversity represented by the VEPS-II program cities was matched by the diversity in the programs developed by the twenty sponsors. The flexibility of the experimental program structure resulted in wide variation in program operation. Differences were apparent in all phases of VEPS-II operations. The generalizations made in the following comparisons of the implementation of the VEPS-II program elements must be interpreted in light of the diverse nature of local project implementation.

Site visits to all VEPS-II cities were conducted by CUP monitoring teams at some time during the program year. However, only eleven cities were subject to intensive study. These cities were selected in consultation with the Manpower Administration based on two factors: (1) potential for the program operation, structure, or other unusual administrative arrangements for yielding useful information on desirable program changes, and (2) ease of gathering data on enrollees. The discussion and analysis of each of the program components is based primarily on field observations and interviews in the eleven intensive study cities.

The main VEPS-II program components and selected topics within each are as follows:

Administration and Staffing

- NYC as the VEPS-II program sponsor.
- Arrangements for staffing the VEPS program team.
- Enrollee payroll procedures--the VEPS cost-sharing feature.

Enrollee Selection

- Determining probable high school dropouts.
- Carryover of enrollees from VEPS-I.
- Using school records and counselors.

Job Development

- VEPS program team as job developers.
- Cost sharing as an incentive to recruit employers.
- VEPS as a work experience/training program.
- Types and sizes of employers.
- Job training positions.

Pre-Job Orientation

- Orientation programs offered.
- Use of material contained in VEPS Model.
- Coordination with job development and placement.

On-Going Counseling

- Enrollee problems--on-the-job, academic and family.
- Procedures for regular on-going counseling.
- Enrollee to counselor ratio.

Career Exploration

- Types of career exploration programs.
- Mechanisms for implementing the sessions.

A. Administration and Staffing

A major change in the VEPS-II guidelines gave the NYC programs sole responsibility for program administration. Since most first year programs were operated by school system sponsored NYC programs, this change merely formalized what had generally existed. Also, by eliminating the dependency of NYC on NAB for job development, duties were to be performed by the NYC program. In cities where NYC was not school sponsored, the confusion over coordination and cooperation among the school system, NYC and NAB was eliminated. Non school sponsored NYC programs, such as Newark and Colorado Springs, knew and were able to plan for the total program responsibility: staff, enrollee recruitment, job development and counseling. It was the clear task of NYC to develop the necessary cooperation with groups such as the schools and NAB. In other cities where the school system sponsored the NYC program (such as Eugene and Flint), little change could be noted from the procedures generally followed during VEPS-I. School sponsorship of NYC ensured the necessary cooperation and access for the VEPS staff.

One factor which made the implementation of VEPS-II more difficult was the lack of supplementary funding for counselors which had been provided by the Office of Education during the first year program. Several approaches were used by cities to overcome this obstacle. Some VEPS-I cities were authorized to use carryover monies from the first year Office of Education funds. Others received additional funding from the Department of Labor in an amount generally sufficient to pay for the addition of a program coordinator. Several cities used Emergency Employment Act or P.E.P. funds to pay for counselors in the VEPS-II program. While these arrangements were not as long as the first year funding pattern, the cities seemed to work out something that met their needs. In several cases, the extra effort strengthened the commitment to make the program succeed as it became an integral part of NYC rather than just a special program.

The NYC share of enrollee wages was to be paid out of the regular NYC funding. Since the NYC cost sharing with employers for enrollee wages was based on each paying fifty percent after the initial orientation, this feature worked to the advantage of VEPS programs. Except for paying all the wages for a maximum of sixty hours for pre-job orientation, NYC programs could pay the wages of one and one-half times as many VEPS enrollees as regular in-school NYC enrollees, because VEPS enrollees worked fifteen hours per week during the school year while NYC enrollees were limited to ten.

As with the VEPS-I experience, there was a tendency for cities to overestimate their ability to enroll and place youth in VEPS. This appears to be primarily the result of the added time necessary to develop jobs and explain adequately the VEPS concept to private sector employers. Although several procedures, such as payroll and cost sharing were simplified in VEPS-II, the program still required a complete and detailed explanation. Discussing a new program with employers who might take one or two students is more time consuming than finding work slots in the public sector (at no cost to the agency) for an established program like NYC.

The 1972-73 VEPS guidelines suggested utilization of a three person VEPS program team consisting of a counselor, vocational specialist and a job developer-counselor. This proved to be one of the more unworkable elements in the second year program. The problem was one of VEPS program size. It had been estimated that a program team of three could work with eighty to one hundred enrollees, an enrollee-to-counselor ratio of approximately 1:30. However, few VEPS programs planned to have one hundred enrollees. Those that enrolled that number generally felt that the counselors should be active in job development and vocational exploration for an assigned number of enrollees. As a result, very little division of effort and specialization took place during VEPS-II. Given the necessity of developing rapport between the enrollee and the counselor and the counselor and the employer, attempts at specialization might better be confined to the vocational and career exploration component.

Several administrative and operational arrangements were common in the second year of VEPS. The most common staffing pattern was to have several counselors (not necessarily certified by school systems) who each carried out the duties of job developer and counselor. A second pattern which was used mainly in smaller VEPS programs was to employ one person to handle all phases of the VEPS program. The third technique which was generally employed in geographically dispersed areas was to assign VEPS enrollees as part of the in-school NYC counselors work load. Each of these systems was based primarily on local circumstances, and none created any particular difficulty given situational constraints.

The role of the school system in cooperating with programs designed for in-school youth continued to present problems in VEPS. Although the number of cases is not large, school systems which were not NYC sponsors, especially in larger cities, were not eager to cooperate with VEPS personnel. This hesitance was usually associated with past experiences with the local NYC programs. In spite of the link between failure to cooperate with VEPS and past NYC program efforts, it is also clear that the school systems felt threatened by VEPS as a possible competitor for work stations. The desire to avoid or minimize the fear of competition was also present in some school systems which sponsored the NYC program.

Generally, some degree of cooperation with the schools was worked out with a minimum of difficulty. Certainly not all school systems were unhappy with a program that was providing work experience, training, career exploration and counseling to some of their students. Where requested, programs usually obtained access to grade and attendance records and high school counselors as well as cooperation on course scheduling, early school release and, often, academic credit for the VEPS work experience. However, Newark was one case where several meetings between the VEPS coordinator and school officials failed to produce any cooperation.

The staffing of VEPS varied depending on the NYC sponsor. School system sponsored NYC's generally required counselors to be certified or at least that the program coordinator be certified. This requirement was frequently based on state regulations. In cities where NYC was sponsored by the OEO-CAP agency or the city, the VEPS counselors were hired from among the counselors used in other youth and manpower programs. In both

cases, the NYC director was usually aware of a number of persons who were qualified to work as counselors in VEPS.

Since the job development phase of the program was clearly identified as a VEPS responsibility from the beginning, the cases of counselors being disappointed with their role as job developer were reduced to only a few. These instances generally resulted from the difficulty of developing part-time training positions for youth in the private sector. Most of the counselors worked well with the flexibility in VEPS.

A major change in the allowable payroll procedures simplified administration of the NYC-employer enrollee wage cost sharing. During VEPS-I a complex switching back and forth between NYC and employer payrolls proved so universally complicated that the guideline was overlooked. In VEPS-II enrollee wages could be shared continuously throughout the program, with NYC and employers each paying 50%. The only exception was that NYC would pay the entire enrollee wage for a maximum sixty hours orientation before the enrollee began at his training site. This guideline change facilitated the explanation of VEPS and facilitated the job development effort.

The actual mechanics of payroll generally involved NYC producing the payroll checks and billing the employers for their fifty percent share. Most participating companies favored this method. In some instances employers paid all the wages and NYC reimbursed them for their share, while in others enrollees received two checks. Several programs had difficulty in working the VEPS payroll into their accounting systems and others had questions about fringe benefits, but these were resolved after only short delays.

B. Enrollee Selection

The selection of VEPS-II enrollees encountered the same kinds of problems that first year programs experienced. There were several complicating factors. VEPS-II enrollees were to be NYC eligible youth who were at least 16 years of age. The requirement that enrollees be "probable dropouts" was retained from the first year and expanded in detail. After consultation with the schools NYC enrollees were to be ranked according to school problems such as grades, attendance and reading difficulty. Programs were to select those students with the highest incidence of problems after permitting some flexibility to reflect personal and family problems. The VEPS-I requirement that students be entering their junior year in the Fall was dropped.

Several factors prevented the probable dropout feature from being fully implemented. First, both new programs and second year programs were generally reluctant to aggressively recruit youth with severe problems. The results of the first year program indicated that success with youth who for all practical purposes had dropped out of school (e.g., were not attending classes or were failing all subjects) was limited. Therefore, some discretion in selection proved desirable. Second, the guidelines provided that enrollees who had participated in the 1971-72 (first year) VEPS program could be re-enrolled in VEPS-II. All the first year programs re-enrolled a number of students. Since many of these students had not been selected

as probable dropouts in any rigorous manner, they were re-enrolled without meeting the new procedures. Third, the necessary school records and access to high school counselors are often not available during the summer months. As many programs began in July and August, they were precluded from obtaining the information to base selection on academic indicators.

The comparisons between cities made throughout this report must take into account the differing selection process which produced enrollees who, while meeting the NYC family income requirements and the 16 year old age minimum, were not the same academically. The outcome of differing selection techniques in the study cities is apparent in the following table which shows the mean grade point average and number of school days missed for the 1971-72 school year. For VEPS-I cities the data for the previous year is also included.

Table 1
PRE-PROGRAM GRADES AND ATTENDANCE

CITY	1971-72		1970-71	
	MEAN GPA	MEAN DAYS ABSENT	MEAN GPA	MEAN DAYS ABSENT
Cleveland, Ohio	1.62	27		
Col. Springs, Col.	2.34	8		
Flint, Michigan	1.64	28	1.74	26
Fort Worth, Texas	2.24	24	2.17	18
Georgetown, Texas	1.84	18		
Las Vegas, Nevada	2.73	18		
Pittsburgh, Pa.	1.39	35	1.07	57
Pueblo, Colorado	1.87	18		
Salt Lake City, Utah	2.19	24	1.96	26
San Bernardino, Cal.	2.31	11	2.41	18

These figures must be considered when interpreting program impact on such factors as academic performance, VEPS program terminations and number of high school dropouts. While few programs appear to have "creamed" enrollees, some had enrollees whose academic problems were not severe, based on available academic criteria. Also, interpretations of impact must take into account that expectations of success tend to be quite op-

timistic as the program begins. Students with all ranges of grade point averages were generally believed to be able to improve substantially.

The range of grade points and absences for the cities tends to mask the essential characteristic of VEPS enrollees. They were seldom in the school's regular programs of work experience or vocational training. In school work experience programs the employer pays one hundred percent of the enrollee wages. As a result school program personnel and employers generally eliminate "problem" youth to maximize employer acceptance and minimize on-the-job problems. This is done in part because work experience counselors have student loads that they could not service properly if they were constantly faced with problems. Another factor is that school training programs for some occupations are very limited and only the better students are permitted to enroll. Therefore, VEPS represented the only opportunity for many youth to obtain training and work experience in the private sector.

The number of problems that VEPS enrollees confront are indicated by reference to some socio-economic and family characteristics. Fifty-eight percent (351) of the VEPS enrollees lived with only one parent or a guardian. Forty-eight percent (317) were in families receiving welfare assistance. In seventy-one percent (395) of the cases the head of the household was unemployed or worked less than 35 hours per week. These indicators together with the academic records of the enrollees provide reasonable evidence that programs were enrolling youth with problems that might lead to dropping out of school.

In summary most cities did not precisely follow the guidelines regarding the selection of probable dropouts. However, although academic indicators show a broad range among cities, the VEPS programs did enroll youth who would typically not be eligible for the school's usual work experience programs. Students in five out of ten cities had aggregate mean grade point averages below a C.

C. Job Development

The change in VEPS-II guidelines which gave VEPS programs the sole responsibility for job development improved this phase considerably. Even new programs were generally more successful than programs operating the VEPS-I experiment. A considerable portion of this success can be attributed to the initial planning to undertake this element and staffing the program to meet this need.

Coordination with other groups such as NAB, Chambers of Commerce and the local employment service offices was stressed in the guidelines. Although these efforts were made in most cities, the programs did not appear to derive major benefits from outside groups. Due to factors such as short lead time and the fact that VEPS was a relatively small experimental program, it was difficult to mobilize any meaningful amount of support from other groups.

VEPS program teams were encouraged to continue the successful thrust of VEPS-I among smaller employers. The experience in the second year of VEPS continued to demonstrate that these employers are most readily recruited for program participation by personalized and individual contact. This means that more time is spent developing training positions, but also promotes the essential rapport between counselor and employer for the ongoing counseling phase of the program.

An additional factor which simplified job development in the cities that had conducted VEPS-I was the carryover of employers. The uncertainty surrounding the future of VEPS during June, 1972, did not cause employers to drop the program. Instead, many participated and expanded the available training slots during VEPS-II.

The carryover of employers into the second program year had two negative aspects. First, some programs had planned throughout the first year to improve some of their training stations. With the natural press for enrollee job openings at the start of the VEPS-II the idea was abandoned in many cases. This served to minimize the start-up time for a share of the total openings in a city. A second and possibly less desirable result was that carryover employers often wanted to retain the youth who had been employed the first year. As a consequence some youth were re-enrolled into VEPS-II, but did not change employers nor necessarily rotate to new job assignments. This partially defeated the concept of VEPS as purely a vocational exploration program, but was generally permitted because VEPS was an experimental program.

While noting that in some instances the failure to alter the job site for re-enrollees was probably detrimental, CUP believes that the flexible combination of work experience, counseling and on-the-job training was generally beneficial in meeting two of VEPS' major goals: reducing high school dropouts and smoothing the transition of youth into the labor market. The same controversy on the merits of exposure to various jobs versus training in a particular job was present during VEPS-I. CUP feels that for VEPS enrollees the latter course was most desirable. For these youth the time for "pure" work experience and career exploration had passed. Gaining experience working and receiving on-the-job training was the need.

The cost sharing feature whereby employers would pay fifty percent of enrollee wages and NYC the other fifty percent continued to provide mixed results. In some cases it confused employers and made them suspicious. In others the employers would not have participated in VEPS without it. The guideline change which split costs equally (except for orientation costs which were to be paid by NYC) throughout the program was most helpful in contributing to employer understanding of the program. The advantages to employers and NYC were clear from the outset.

Some would argue that VEPS would not have obtained employers without the cost sharing feature. While the extra incentive that this provided cannot be determined, it is instructive to examine briefly a concept that Pittsburgh used during the VEPS-II year. Through separate funding the

school system which sponsors NYC was able to obtain monies to pay for job developer-counselors in a program called Select Employment Training (SET). This program operated in much the same manner as VEPS with respect to youth selection, job development and the provision of intensive counseling services. The major difference was that the employers paid all enrollee wages. The counseling support and need for opportunities for all students were the main points used in recruiting employers for the program. Many employers did participate in SET even though the students were not as well qualified as those that could be obtained from the school system's regular work experience programs. Therefore, even where cost sharing is not possible a VEPS type program with a high level of supportives may be operated.

Data on 691 VEPS-II enrollees indicates that 464 (67%) were placed in firms with one to nineteen employees (45% in companies employing fewer than 10), 130 (19%) in firms with twenty to forty-nine employees, and 97 (14%) in firms employing over fifty workers. Although rotation to different work stations was not a consistent policy, almost one-third of the enrollees had at least two separate work experiences. The significance of the number of smaller employers is that the enrollees were exposed to a wide variety of duties even though they were not formally assigned to a different work station. The work experiences were classified into ninety-eight standard occupational codes, representing 296 separate work experiences.

The job development effort focused attention on another benefit from the program. In many areas, especially rural counties, the number and quality of public sector training sites for NYC enrollees was limited. Placement in the private sector provided more and better training positions and an opportunity for experience that would be more marketable in the local community.

The overall outcome of the job development phase was successful. Some cities were not able to develop as many jobs as quickly as they had hoped. But this often appeared to be a result of the local economic situation. The VEPS counselors encountered the typical range of problems that manpower program job developers discover. These usually centered on the lack of summer openings in July when programs were beginning, employer unfamiliarity with VEPS, and, for carryover employers, the reduction of the NYC contribution for enrollee wages to one-half from two-thirds.

Job development proceeded more effectively in VEPS-II due primarily to placing the responsibility with the VEPS program team. Simplification of the payroll procedures also was helpful. First year employers who continued with VEPS-II hampered program changes in some cities where counselors did not want to lose training positions. Enrollees were generally placed with smaller employers who provided training and close supervision, but who often did not formally rotate youth to different work stations. Although there were exceptions, most training positions offered more potential for the enrollees than those previously available. This was especially true in rural areas with limited public sector openings.

D. Pre-Job Orientation

The 1972-73 VEPS guidelines provided for a maximum of sixty hours over three weeks for pre-job orientation with the enrollee wages to be paid by the NYC program. The sessions were to include "world-of-work" orientation and an introduction to vocational exploration. If job development had produced some openings, referrals for job ready youth were scheduled to begin the second or third week.

The inclusion of specific information on orientation in the guidelines as well as the provision of a sample orientation program in the VEPS Model produced improvement in this program element during the second year. Most cities used portions of the sample orientation program or materials they had developed to give enrollees an introduction to the world-of-work and the private sector. Unfortunately, only a few cities took advantage of the full sixty hours to introduce vocation and career exploration materials. This was due in part to the continued emphasis on selecting probable drop-outs which resulted in enrolling youth with little or no work experience except possibly NYC positions.

Each program conducted some modification of the suggested pre-job orientation program. The sessions varied in length, scope and format of presentation. The length varied from one hour informal sessions to two week structured sessions. Generally, smaller VEPS-II programs which were operated by a single person as VEPS coordinator-counselor-job developer devoted less time to pre-job orientation; these programs were usually undertaking VEPS for the first time. Offsetting the tendency for smaller first time programs to shorten the time allocated due to other program needs (such as job development) was the greater acceptance and use of the sample pre-job orientation program in Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Model for Implementing the 1972-73 Guidelines.

Programs continued to interpret the scope of orientation narrowly. Few programs took advantage of the full sixty hours permitted. Also, most did not include much material that could be considered as vocational exploration. Both of these situations were created by the nature of the program and the staffing. It is difficult for staff in new responsibilities to implement a program such as VEPS which has a number of experimental features (e.g., cost sharing). Since pre-job orientation was an early program phase, it was needed before the staff was able to utilize its potential fully. Second year cities generally made fuller use of the orientation time. In these cases the staff was fully acquainted with the program and had the experience of conducting orientation for VEPS-I. These programs were less likely to utilize materials from the Model having in most cases prepared many of their own items.

The presentation format varied from individual counseling type sessions to group sessions with semi-structured presentations. The longer orientation programs tended to meet in groups for part of the day with the rest devoted to job development. Cities which went beyond the brief introduction to NYC and VEPS usually were able to use one-on-one and group sessions.

The high incidence of enrollee problems requiring counseling in all cities during VEPS-II makes it difficult to assess which combination of pre-job orientation approaches is best. Based on observations made during site-visits, it generally appeared that a longer time period spent with the VEPS enrollees provided more information on necessary world-of-work attitudes and established rapport between the enrollees and counselors. This latter objective is extremely important since the enrollees' cooperation was essential if on-going counseling was to be effective. The longer sessions were generally accepted by enrollees, especially when the stress was placed on how the orientation will assist in obtaining jobs and when a variety of teaching and counseling techniques were used.

E. On-Going Counseling

On-going counseling was reasonably effective in VEPS-II as it had been the first year. Dealing with enrollees who have a number of academic and personal problems mitigated against total success. Some youth terminated from the program and some dropped out of high school. The counselors in VEPS-II evidenced a high level of dedication to the needs of the enrollees. For example, most programs continued to work with an enrollee to achieve some satisfactory result, even if he terminated VEPS and dropped out of school.

The VEPS-II guidelines called for on-going counseling including employer contacts to be maintained throughout the program. It was expected that a portion of the counselor's time would be devoted to crisis situations related to the enrollees training site, academic work or family circumstances. In addition, counselors were responsible for deciding if enrollee transfers should be made and whether or not employers should receive new enrollees if any quit their training positions.

Although Office of Education funds were not available for VEPS-II staffing, programs were generally staffed so that the enrollee-to-counselor ratio was approximately thirty to one. As a result, counselors were able to devote a great deal of time to maintaining enrollee and employer contacts. After the initial job development phase, counselors spent their time in the following activities:

- (1) Making periodic contacts with enrollees and employers to determine enrollee progress;
- (2) Continuing job development for enrollees who had not been placed or to replace employers who dropped out of the program;
- (3) Intervening in crisis situations involving an enrollee's VEPS training station, academic difficulties, or family related problems;
- (4) Handling the procedural aspects of the program, including such items as time cards, payroll checks, enrollee evaluation forms (usually used when high school credit was being granted), and arranging school schedule changes.

Enrollee counseling was most frequently done at the job site, but counselors also made contact with enrollees at the VEPS office, school and the enrollee's home. After the pre-job orientation, the counseling sessions were usually on a one-to-one basis, although where several enrollees were with the same employer or in the same school, small group sessions were also used.

Where VEPS-II was operated by only one person, the number of tasks required by the program left little time for routine counseling. Continuing job development, regular program procedures and emergency situations together with an attempt to operationalize the vocational exploration component left little or no additional time. In programs with more staff it may be possible to increase the number of enrollees that each counselor works with; however, this does not appear feasible in programs with only one professional staff person.

Predominantly rural areas had more difficulty in making frequent enrollee contact because of the distances involved. This was offset to some extent in programs which assigned VEPS enrollees to the regular NYC counselors. This procedure would generally not be desirable due to the differences in enrollees between the programs, but seemed the best possible solution given the geographic character of some of the program areas. There were some indications that the dual responsibility facilitated transfers from VEPS back into NYC when the counselor felt the enrollee was not ready or unable to accept training in the private sector.

The success of counselors in establishing and maintaining relationships with the school was generally good. In most cases, VEPS-II programs were able to work out arrangements to grant high school credit for the work experience and training received in VEPS. This was also accomplished where the NYC program was not sponsored by the school system. In some cases the VEPS students were enrolled in the regular high school vocational or career exploration classes in order to qualify the students for credit. VEPS-II in Newark, New Jersey, was the only program unable to gain any cooperation from the school system. In Eugene, Oregon, state law prevented release to CUP of some academic data on enrollees, but the school district sponsored NYC program had no other problems.

Employers were generally pleased with the program, though in many cases, they expressed dismay at the types of problems the youth created. CUP believes that VEPS served to make a group of smaller employers aware of methods that would be useful to employ younger workers. In many cases employers had not utilized this potential source of manpower to any great extent. In most cases, once the employer had decided to participate, the relations with the counselor proceeded normally. As would be expected if the employer was not willing to cooperate with the program concept or the counselor, he just would not accept any VEPS students.

The problems encountered in VEPS-II by employers and enrollees were unchanged from VEPS-I. Counselors worked with enrollees in such areas as reporting to work on time, general requirements of the position, follow-

ing the supervisor's instructions, arranging any time off in advance, being interested in their work, etc. Enrollees faced a number of difficulties at school in connection with holding their VEPS training position. VEPS counselors usually worked through the regular high school counselors to arrange early release from school, adequate transportation (usually by providing bus passes), and changes in school course schedules.

The number of counseling-type problems seriously hampered the full implementation of the career and vocational exploration programs in some cities. This generally occurred in cities with one or two person staffs. The only solution to this problem would be to operate with a minimum staff size of about three. Lowering the enrollee-to-counselor ratio would not provide the necessary assistance unless there were more staff. The ratio in VEPS-II was approximately 1:30. CUP believes that in larger programs with more specialized roles, particularly career exploration, that one counselor could serve thirty-five to forty-five youth depending on their characteristics and problems. Based on VEPS-II, one person programs appear able to serve a maximum of thirty-five enrollees.

Remediation for enrollees was provided sporadically. Some cities attempted to determine enrollee needs in academic areas. Others merely waited for severe problems to surface and then worked with enrollees individually or by referring them to proper remedial classes. Remediation seemed more acceptable to enrollees where the VEPS staff conducted the sessions.

F. Career Exploration

VEPS-II programs were not notably more successful in implementing on-going career exploration than first year cities had been. Two factors continued to be the major obstacles. First, the program staffs generally did not have as much experience in career exploration as they did in counseling. This fact and the variety of other activities required to implement VEPS-II meant that some cities did not begin the type of program outlined in the guidelines. Also, some second year programs did not move aggressively to revise their first year approach.

The second major factor was that some cities were overly concerned about employer acceptance. Because training stations were needed, they were sometimes developed without regard to the enrollees' future participation in career exploration sessions. Such training stations were often excellent in terms of the opportunity it offered the enrollee, but may have reduced his chances for participation in any scheduled vocational exploration sessions. Where this occurred, counselors usually felt that employers would not cooperate if they could not count on the enrollee's presence on a regularly scheduled basis. This reflects the potential conflict within the dual nature of VEPS--part work experience and part on-the-job training.

Another problem the rural areas and, to a lesser extent, other cities faced was the physical impossibility of counseling small groups of students on a regular basis. These programs generally relied on more individual

sessions throughout the year to introduce the enrollee to the vocational exploration materials. In some cases, the schools or the employment service office was utilized for the delivery of vocational and career information. The small staff size of some programs constricted available time for formalized career exploration.

In spite of these difficulties, cities operated some type of vocational and career exploration for VEPS-II enrollees. These sessions were usually shorter in time and smaller in scope than that presented in the VEPS model. Also, most programs devoted a great deal of time to dealing with the world-of-work problems that enrollees were encountering.

Vocational exploration sessions during 1972-1973 utilized various techniques, including:

- (1) Guest speakers from local companies discussing work requirements generally and career opportunities specifically;
- (2) Speakers from other agencies and institutions such as the employment service and junior colleges discussing careers and scholarships;
- (3) Audio-visual materials such as films, film strips, and tape cassettes on careers and world-of-work attitudes;
- (4) Small group discussions about current VEPS training positions, youth experiences and related problems;
- (5) Presentations by the VEPS program staff on topics such as income taxes, the local labor market, unions, the value of work, etc.

A major accomplishment of these sessions and discussions was the enrollee awareness of what work meant. Many for the first time were working and not just learning in a classroom about what would be expected. Others who had held NYC positions reiterated the feelings of the first year enrollees -- "The private sector expects us to do more." Grasping the challenge and opportunity of work and gaining concrete experience appear to outweigh the compromises in the official guidelines for the VEPS-II experimental program.

PART IV

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMMATIC IMPACT ON ENROLLEES

In monitoring and assessing VEPS-II, the Center for Urban Programs collected information on 716 enrollees in eleven intensively studied cities: Cleveland, Ohio (99); Colorado Springs, Colorado (41); Eugene, Oregon (42); Flint, Michigan (67); Fort Worth, Texas (63); Georgetown, Texas (25); Las Vegas, Nevada (21); Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (70); Pueblo, Colorado (41); Salt Lake City, Utah (122); and San Bernardino, California (125). This compares to the 433 youth in eight cities studied in VEPS-I. Other cities that either considered or implemented VEPS programs but were not intensively studied include Albuquerque, New Mexico; Davenport, Iowa; Haverhill and Lawrence, Massachusetts; Newark, New Jersey; Newport News and Norfolk, Virginia; and Columbus, Ohio.

The information collected consisted of the following: (a) where available, demographic, background information and personal histories taken from NYC intake forms; (b) VEPS employment history and final disposition provided by program directors and counselors; and (c) academic data obtained from enrollees' high school records. Complete data was usually not available for those youth who terminated the program; obviously, incomplete data exists in those cases where the youth dropped out of school. The CUP monitoring teams also experienced difficulty in obtaining comparable data with the VEPS-I youth. This situation resulted from the fact that the NYC-16 form was no longer being utilized in all programs; this form had been basic to data collection in VEPS-I. As a consequence, the monitoring teams relied upon VEPS counseling staff and enrollee assistance to fill in missing information; inevitably, however, substantial portions of the data remained fugitive. In several cities significant gaps developed for the purposes of comparing VEPS-I and VEPS-II demographic data; only minimal information was obtained from Colorado Springs. In other cities specific information with regard to academic background and performance could not be obtained; Eugene was one such case. For the majority of enrollees, however, sufficient information was available to permit a meaningful assessment of programmatic impact, an isolation of those factors which appear to be related to specific outcomes, and a comparison with VEPS-I.

At the outset, several cautions should be made clear. First, percentage figures are based on the total number of cases for which information is available; consequently, N may vary below the universe of 716 youth. Second, data on all beginning enrollees is utilized as the base in Sections A and B: Profile of the VEPS Enrollees and Work Experience of VEPS Enrollees. Other sections analyze program completions, program terminations, and high school dropouts; in these cases the N reflects the specific group. Finally, where only marginal frequencies are reported, detailed tables may be found in Appendix D. Wherever appropriate, comparisons are drawn with the VEPS-I program.

A. Profile of the VEPS Enrollees

Because VEPS youth had to be eligible for NYC to participate in VEPS, all enrollees met the poverty income criteria. In Table 2, selected demographic characteristics of enrollees are presented, controlled for participating cities and compared with the VEPS-I result. For comparative purposes, baseline national NYC in-school data on enrollee demographic characteristics are available in Manpower Report of the President (March, 1973) and the final report of the VEPS-I project.*

A majority (52.1%) of the VEPS-II enrollees were males, down slightly from the 52.4% found in the VEPS-I program and 56.6% reported for the national NYC in-school program for Fiscal Year 1972. In four of the eleven cities, however, females constituted a majority of the enrollees (Las Vegas, 90.5%; Colorado Springs, 56.1%; Salt Lake City, 54.1%; San Bernardino, 57.6%). The VEPS-II program deemphasized the age sixteen requirement, mandating only that youth working on job sites have attained that age. As a consequence, the frequency distribution among the age patterns differs considerably from that of VEPS-I. In VEPS-I over half of the enrollees were age sixteen, while in VEPS-II only slightly more than one-third (37.9%) were age sixteen. An approximately equal proportion were age seventeen, and almost double were age eighteen in VEPS-II. The carry-over of enrollees from VEPS-I into VEPS-II in several cities partially accounts for this difference. Flint, Fort Worth and Pittsburgh, all VEPS-I cities, have heavy concentrations of seventeen year old enrollees. Due to the needs of its work sites, Las Vegas also had a significant concentration. The arbitrary date of July 1, 1972, was used to standardize age distributions. Although 15.4% of the enrollees were age fifteen at the time of enrollment, all of these had turned sixteen by the time of job placement. As noted below, this age distribution pattern is reflected in the year in school of the enrollees.

One-third of the enrollees were white, 45.0% were black, and 20.8% had Spanish surnames. This distribution is not dissimilar from that of VEPS-I, representing a slight increase among those with Spanish surnames and a slight decrease among blacks. Although internal variations can be found between and among cities, most of these inter-city differences can be explained in terms of variances in ethnic concentrations in the areas. As would be expected concentrations of youth enrollees with Spanish surnames occurred in Colorado Springs, Fort Worth, Georgetown, Pueblo, Salt Lake City, and San Bernardino. Compared to national data, whites are somewhat underrepresented (40.0% nationally compared to 33.3% for VEPS-II) as are blacks (53.4% nationally as compared to 45.0%), while youth with Spanish surnames are somewhat overrepresented (6.6% nationally as compared to 20.8%).

*Center for Urban Programs, Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector: Final Report and Assessment 1971-1972.

TABLE 2

SELECTED ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS, BY CITY AND TOTAL

Enrollee Characteristic	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC.	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total	
SEX	(N)	(99)	(41)	(42)	(67)	(63)	(25)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(125)	(716)	(433)
Male	66.7%	43.9%	66.7%	50.7%	52.4%	60.0%	9.5%	58.6%	65.9%	45.9%	42.4%	52.1%	52.4%	
Female	33.3	56.1	33.3	49.3	47.6	40.0	90.5	41.4	34.1	54.1	57.6	47.9	47.6	
AGE	(N)	(99)	(40)	(42)	(67)	(59)	(23)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(125)	(709)	(410)
15 or Younger	10.1%	12.5%	35.7%	7.5%	5.1%	4.3%	--%	5.7%	7.3%	11.5%	39.2%	15.4%	12.2%	
16 Years	39.4	45.0	23.8	34.3	30.5	39.1	42.9	21.4	31.7	44.3	48.8	37.9	53.5	
17 Years	31.3	37.5	40.5	44.8	55.9	30.4	42.9	45.7	48.8	35.2	10.4	35.3	27.4	
18 or Older	19.2	5.0	--	13.4	8.5	26.1	14.3	27.2	12.2	9.0	1.6	11.4	6.9	
ETHNIC BACK-														
GROUND	(N)	(99)	(40)	(42)	(67)	(63)	(25)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(125)	(715)	(432)
Black	75.8%	15.0%	--%	83.6%	77.8%	60.0%	66.7%	92.9%	2.4%	10.7%	22.4%	45.0%	47.9%	
White	15.2	40.0	97.6	9.0	6.3	28.0	33.3	7.1	2.4	69.7	40.8	33.3	33.1	
Spanish Surname	9.1	45.0	2.4	6.0	15.9	12.0	--	--	95.1	15.6	36.8	20.8	18.1	
Other	--	--	--	1.5	--	--	--	--	--	4.1	--	0.8	0.9	
YEAR IN SCHOOL	(N)	(99)	(39)	(42)	(66)	(63)	(24)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(123)	(710)	(426)
Freshman	6.1%	2.6%	--%	--%	--%	4.2%	--%	2.9%	--%	--%	0.8%	1.5%	1.6%	
Sophomore	23.2	5.1	23.8	--	1.6	16.7	--	12.9	--	2.5	13.8	9.7	6.8	
Junior	29.3	33.3	21.4	40.9	23.8	54.2	4.8	22.9	29.3	53.3	68.3	40.0	67.1	
Senior	41.4	59.0	54.8	59.1	74.6	25.0	95.2	61.4	70.7	44.3	17.1	48.7	24.5	

While the VEPS-I program concentrated on youth enrollees in their junior year in high school, the VEPS-II program had no such concentration requirement. As a result and as shown in the distribution in Table 2, representation of freshmen and sophomores is approximately the same for both program years, while in VEPS-II somewhat fewer juniors (di = 27.1%) and somewhat more seniors (di = 24.2%) are included. The concentration of seniors reflects the attitude of program personnel in several cities that the VEPS program was ideally suited for seniors about to enter the labor force. A majority of seniors can be found, in seven of the eleven cities.

The stereotype pathology of poverty generally holds true for the VEPS enrollees, although some differences in degree do emerge (see Appendix Table D-1). In over one-third of the cases (37.1%), both parents lived in the household; this is up slightly from the 36.2% found in the VEPS-I program. In 49.7% of the cases, youth identified their mother as head of household, down from the 54.5% found in VEPS-I. Slightly more than one-fourth of the heads of household (28.6%) were employed more than thirty-five hours per week at the time of enrollment; this is down from the 31.1% in VEPS-I; in VEPS-II, 56.0% of the heads of household were unemployed (54.0% in VEPS-I) and 15.4% were working part-time, that is less than thirty-five hours per week; this is up slightly from the 14.9% in VEPS-I. Although the differences are not significant, VEPS-II enrollees came from households whose heads showed lower employment levels than those in the VEPS-I program. Unemployment by the head of household was generally higher in the older industrial centers of the East and Midwest. It should be remembered, however, that employment of the head of household information is dated, since it normally reflects the household situation during the week immediately preceding completion of the NYC intake form. The data are further suspect since, in the attempt to obtain directly comparable information, the CUP monitoring teams collected employment information at points later than the initiation of the program.

In VEPS-I less than a third of the youth (30.8%) contributed to the support of the family through their earnings; in the VEPS-II program however, nearly one-half (47.2%) contributed to the support of the family. As with VEPS-I only a small minority (17.4%) of the VEPS-II youth lived in public housing. This figure is slightly skewed due to the varying amounts of public housing available in the participating cities. Slightly less than half (47.9%) of the enrollees' families received any form of public assistance, compared to a national rate of 29.9% and to the precise same rate (47.9%) in VEPS-I.

Among the participating programs some variation in enrollee employment history does exist (see Appendix Table D-2). In each of the cities at least half of the enrollees had previously been employed for wages, ranging from 52.4% in Fort Worth to 97.8% in Cleveland. Overall, almost three-quarters (74.6%) of the VEPS-II youth had previously worked; this is substantially higher than the 58.3% in VEPS-I and is partially accounted for by the generally older group in VEPS-II. As with VEPS-I only a small number (9.3%) were employed at the time of enrollment in the program. Cleveland with 36.4% was the only city having a sizable proportion employed

at the beginning of the program; in three cities--Eugene, Fort Worth, and Las Vegas--no youth were currently employed. While only slightly more than half (51.1%) of the VEPS-I enrollees had worked for thirty days or longer, nearly two-thirds (66.5%) of the VEPS-II youth had been employed for at least thirty days.

This employment history data should not be considered as reflective of substantial or diversified work experience on the part of the enrollees. Ample evidence exists that the substantial proportion of the enrollees with experience had obtained it through the regular NYC program in public sector slots. Moreover, enrollees who continued into VEPS-II from VEPS-I account for a small percentage as well.

The VEPS-II program emphasized somewhat more strongly the probable dropout criterion for youth selection than did the VEPS-I pilot program. An analysis of the enrollee academic records demonstrates that some programs were more rigorous than others in their selection of youth. Although academic factors are only one indicator of a probable dropout--others being attitudes, home situations, discipline problems--the experience has been that school performance is a reasonably good basis for identifying the dropout prone. Some programs appear to have operationalized probable in terms of possible. Other programs--Las Vegas is an example--selected youth on the basis of the work station requirements and the willingness of the employers to hire "problem" youth. Table 3 lists the mean grade point average and mean days absent for youth in each of the participating

TABLE 3

PRI-PROGRAM MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND DAYS ABSENT
FOR VEPS ENROLLEES, BY CITY

City	Academic Indicators*	
	Mean Grade Point Average	Mean Days Absent
Cleveland	1.62	27
Colorado Springs	2.34	08
Eugene	N.A.	N.A.
Flint	1.64	28
Fort Worth	2.24	24
Georgetown	1.84	18
Las Vegas	2.73	18
Pittsburgh	1.39	35
Pueblo	1.87	18
Salt Lake City	2.19	24
San Bernardino	2.31	11

*Based on a 4.0 grade point scale; days absent were obtained by standardizing individual city statistics. Data are based on the 1971-72 academic year.

programs. The variation among programs ranges from a grade point average of 2.73 in Las Vegas (where all youth were placed in branches of a bank) to a 1.39 in Pittsburgh. In terms of mean days absent, the range is from a low of eight days in Colorado Springs to a high of thirty-five in Pittsburgh.

Although in certain instances the evidence that the youth selected were probable dropouts is weak, it should be also remembered that the process of selection involved the exercise of personal judgment by the counselor. In selecting youth such unquantifiable factors as personal problems, social disability, or attitudinal disenchantment were certainly involved. Moreover, some youth were selected solely on the basis of the potential benefit that the youth would receive from the VEPS experience.

In summary, the VEPS-II youth are quite comparable to those who were involved in the VEPS-I project except for the tendency of the former to be slightly older and more advanced in school year. The poverty pathology is substantiated, and VEPS-II youth were somewhat more prone to contribute to the support of the family. More VEPS-II youth had had some work experience prior to enrollment in VEPS, but this is explained by the age differential. There is no evidence to indicate that this experience took place outside the regular NYC program. Based on academic indicators only, the selection of probable dropouts was less evident in VEPS-II than VEPS-I, despite the emphasis given to probable dropouts in the guidelines.

B. Work Experience of VEPS Enrollees

Based on the VEPS-I experience, VEPS-II encouraged the placement of youth at work sites in small or medium sized employers. Experience indicated that (1) such positions were easier to develop than bloc placements with large employers and (2) personal interest and supervision were greater in the small and medium sized firms. Choice was required between situations in which the youth would receive closer supervision in the development of good work habits and marketable skills in the small and medium sized placements, and the possibilities for promotion that exist with large employers. The VEPS-II program opted for the former. Most job stations were developed by the VEPS counseling staff; in cities which had run VEPS-I programs, substantial numbers of employers carried over into VEPS-II. Negligible aid was received from Chambers of Commerce and the National Alliance of Businessmen; this was to be expected given prior experience. The absence of such assistance was an additional factor in the inability generally to obtain blocs of jobs with larger employers.

The size of employers, controlled by city, who participated in the VEPS-II program is given in Table 4; size is measured in terms of the number of full-time employees. Most work stations were with small or medium sized employers as had been recommended; two-thirds (67.1%) were with employers having less than twenty full-time employees, while 44.8% had fewer than ten. Only 10.0% of the employers were in the large (over 100 full-time employees) category. The general pattern holds for most of the cities although some variations can be seen. Las Vegas is an obvious exception; all youth were placed with the Bank of Nevada. In Cleveland, 19.8% were

TABLE 4

SIZE OF VEPS EMPLOYERS (NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES), BY CITY

Number of Employees	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
1-4	26.0%	48.8%	33.3%	4.9%	1.6%	28.0%	0.0%	14.5%	44.4%	42.6%	14.2%	23.7%	23.0%
5-9	14.6	12.2	38.5	34.4	37.7	28.0	0.0	8.7	30.6	15.6	20.8	21.1	26.6
10-19	11.5	29.3	17.9	39.3	27.9	8.0	0.0	29.0	5.6	16.4	32.5	22.3	14.9
20-29	15.6	4.9	0.0	16.4	18.0	8.0	0.0	20.3	2.8	4.9	13.3	11.1	6.3
30-49	9.4	0.0	10.3	0.0	3.3	12.0	0.0	7.2	5.6	13.9	9.2	7.7	7.1
50-99	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	16.0	0.0	11.6	8.3	4.1	2.5	4.0	11.7
100 or More	<u>19.8</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>10.4</u>
TOTAL	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
(N)	(96)	(41)	(39)	(61)	(61)	(25)	(21)	(69)	(36)	(122)	(120)	(691)	(395)

placed with large employers. At the other end of the scale, Eugene (0.0%), Flint (1.6%), Pueblo (2.8%), and Salt Lake City (2.5%) had no or very few large employer sites and a heavy concentration among the less-than-twenty employee work sites. In Pueblo four out of five work sites fell in this category; in Eugene nine out of ten work sites had fewer than twenty employees. Most program administrators agreed that smaller employers were of greater benefit to the enrollees. These employers often had more time to provide direct, personal supervision; they often took a personal interest in the youth and frequently were willing to deal with problem situations in a less impersonal manner than might be found in large organizations.

While the data reported in Table 4 reflect only the size of employer of the first work station to which a VEPS youth was assigned, it is a quite accurate description of all VEPS work sites. While 30.8% of the enrollees had more than one work experience, these experiences were almost always with the same employer.

NYC work experience has often been criticized as lacking transferability and applicability to the private sector; the range of experiences is quite limited and may, in fact, encourage work habits not consistent with the demands of the private sector. VEPS enrollees, on the other hand, enjoyed a wide range of experiences. Table 5 lists these experiences by general categories. Appendix E contains a comprehensive listing of specific job titles held by enrollees. The general job code is based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population: Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations, which provides twelve general classifications of occupations; these were reduced to the eight shown in the Table.*

VEPS work stations were concentrated in the clerical (27.8%), service (20.7%), and Operative (19.0%) categories. The clerical category represents mostly secretarial, receptionist and office aide positions; as might be expected these were held mostly by women. Although the service category was represented mainly by food service workers, there were a sizable number of youth working in the child care area. Most operatives worked as mechanics or gas station attendants. Few youth obtained positions in the professional or managerial fields. This, of course, was not unexpected given the training qualifications and experience required for these positions. Colorado Springs (41.5%) and San Bernardino (35.0%) relied heavily on clerical jobs; Flint had most (40.9%) in the service area; Pueblo had 41.7% in the operative category. Cleveland and Georgetown each had heavy concentrations in the clerical and service occupations; Salt Lake City in the clerical and operative areas. Overall the differences among cities are not significant and tend to reflect the employment situation in each area. What does emerge is the wide variety and diversity in the work stations occupied by VEPS enrollees.

*The twelve categories were reduced to eight in the following manner: Farmers and Farm Managers were grouped with Managers and Administrators; Transport Equipment Operatives were combined with Operatives; Farm Laborers and Farm Foremen were grouped with Laborers; Private Household Workers were combined with Service Workers. Apparently, no youth worked in any of the eliminated categories.

TABLE 5

CATEGORICAL DISTRIBUTION OF VEPS OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES, BY CITY

Occupational Category	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
Professional	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	8.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	2.2%
Managerial	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Sales	14.6	7.3	7.7	8.2	4.9	12.0	0.0	18.8	5.5	10.7	15.0	11.1	11.7
Clerical	22.9	41.5	12.8	22.9	26.2	24.0	95.2	15.9	13.9	27.9	35.0	27.8	34.9
Craftsman	3.1	4.9	7.7	1.6	21.3	12.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.2	5.8	6.5	4.8
Operative	12.5	7.3	25.6	9.8	19.8	8.0	0.0	29.0	41.7	24.6	17.5	19.0	18.3
Laborer	15.6	22.0	23.1	16.4	11.5	8.0	0.0	14.5	16.7	13.9	9.2	13.9	18.8
Service	<u>31.2</u>	<u>17.1</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>13.1</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>13.9</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>15.8</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>8.6</u>
TOTAL	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	99.8%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
(N)	(96)	(41)	(39)	(61)	(61)	(25)	(21)	(69)	(36)	(122)	(120)	(691)	(581)

-49-

Using the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population: Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations, each identifiable work experience of the VEPS enrollee was classified and listed. Using this scheme, ninety-eight different occupational codes were necessary to cover the range of work experiences; this compares to eighty-five in VEPS-I. Concentrations, of course, appeared in certain classifications: 104 were general clerical workers; ninety-three were salesmen; fifty-five were general operatives; forty-seven were food service workers; and twenty-eight were waiters or waitresses. Such a listing does not differentiate sufficiently among the types of experience gained by the youth. Within the ninety-eight occupational codes, 296 discrete work experiences were identified (133 in VEPS-I). Even this refinement tends to mask the range and type of work experience. For example, the Code 280 occupational category--salesman--does not distinguish between sales youth in grocery stores, department stores, clothing stores, or record stores. The mere enumeration does not permit one to appreciate either the range of occupations or the diversity within each category.

CUP monitoring teams found many instances where jobs were developed which afforded the enrollees unusual advantage. When career interest was clearly identified, most VEPS job developers attempted to place the youth in work stations closely akin to that interest. An outstanding example was the youth whose interest was photography. This enrollee was placed with a commercial photographer and, before the end of the program, was taking portraits for the studio. Other interesting work stations included: accountant trainee, systems analysts, advertising, bank tellers, data processing, bookbinding, floral arranging, moldmaking, printing and ranch management.

In addition to the type of work experience, another dimension worthy of consideration is the number of work experiences each enrollee received. In other words, to what extent did job placement provide exposure to a range of work tasks for the youth? It is extremely difficult to determine the exact number of work experiences that an enrollee had. Change of work station is one indicator. Different experience in the same position would be another. An enrollee working at a filling station may pump gas, work the cash register, service cars, do mechanical repairs, clean up, run errands, etc. To label this experience simply as gas station attendant is to understate the situation. The difficulty in tracking the total chain of work experience forces an enumeration of only the clearly identifiable, separate and distinct experiences. The data in Table 6 provide the results of this enumeration.

Multiple work experiences were most common in Cleveland (51.0%). Colorado Springs (41.5%), Flint (40.9%) and Salt Lake City (38.5%) also had numbers of youth with multiple work experiences. At the other end of the range, six cities--Georgetown (88.0%), Pueblo (83.3%), Eugene (82.1%), Las Vegas (81.0%), Fort Worth (80.3%), and San Bernardino (79.2%)--tended toward keeping enrollees in a single work experience. Among all youth, 30.8% had more than one work experience, down somewhat from VEPS-I (46.7%). In inspecting these data, it must be borne in mind that any one work experience might include a variety of exposures. Too great a reliance on these figures would leave one with a much distorted perception of the actual range of work experiences.

In summary the work experience data are indicative of several patterns. First, job development was easiest among small employers (less than ten full-

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF VEPS WORK EXPERIENCES FOR ENROLLEES, BY CITY

Number of Experiences	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
One	49.0%	58.5%	82.1%	59.0%	80.3%	88.0%	81.0%	73.9%	83.3%	61.5%	79.2%	69.2%	53.3%
Two	42.7	36.6	17.9	31.1	18.0	12.0	19.0	26.1	13.9	27.0	19.2	25.9	36.5
Three	7.3	4.9	0.0	9.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	10.7	0.8	4.5	8.8
Four or More	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>1.4</u>
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
(N)	(96)	(41)	(39)	(61)	(61)	(25)	(21)	(69)	(36)	(122)	(120)	(691)	(411)

-51-

time employees, 44.8% were in this category. Two-thirds (67.1%) of the employers had less than twenty full-time employees. Second, the range of occupations and experiences opened to the enrollees was quite broad. The range and type of experiences enabled VEPS to provide the enrollees a more realistic exposure to the world-of-work and its opportunities than is provided by most regular NYC public sector programs.

C. General Assessment of Programmatic Impact

The guidelines contained in Field Memorandum 195-72 identified the basic objectives of the VEPS program as: (1) reducing the high school drop-out rate; (2) providing disadvantaged students with skills enabling them, upon graduation from high school, to move on to further education or a job in the private sector; and (3) helping disadvantaged students experience achievement and learn the value of education and training as preparation for the world of work. In the assessment papers prepared by CUP to provide DOL with a mid-program perspective for VEPS-I (January, 1972) and VEPS-II (May, 1973), seven outcomes were identified as having positive or favorable characteristics. While the assessment report of May, 1973, was written toward the terminus of the VEPS-II program year, that report reflected only partial and scattered data; nonetheless, the preliminary indications for VEPS-II were comparable to the preliminary assessment for VEPS-I. Since the final VEPS-I report confirmed the accuracy of the preliminary assessment, there was little reason to suspect that the VEPS-II experience would differ substantially.

The seven outcomes that have transferability between the two program years are: (1) a reduced tendency to drop out from school among VEPS enrollees comparable to regular in-school NYC youth; (2) improved academic achievement for VEPS enrollees; (3) improved school attendance patterns; (4) improved disciplinary status; (5) evidence that the VEPS program had provided realistic attitude development and growth in individual responsibility; (6) private sector skill development for youth not normally participants in regular school work-experience programs; and (7) enthusiastic support for the VEPS program among VEPS personnel. The current grant to the Center for Urban Programs provides for a VEPS-I longitudinal impact assessment of these preliminary findings; the report on that study should be available in July, 1974.

In the analysis sections which follow, we have utilized academic data, job outcome information, employability patterns, and programmatic experiences of assorted types to assess the degree to which the VEPS program achieved the guideline objectives and to test the validity of the findings in the preliminary assessment. For organizational purposes, the data have been organized and presented under the seven topical headings relating to the outcomes specified above. Since programmatic objectives can be fairly implied in each of these, the pertinence of the analysis is obvious.

C.1. Impact on the Dropout Rate. Data in Table 7 provide summary disposition information for the 716 VEPS-II enrollees, and for comparative purposes, summary outcome data for VEPS-I. Over half (53.9%) of the enrollees completed the year long program. This completion rate is considerably

TABLE 7

SUMMARY DISPOSITION OF ENROLLEES, BY CITY

DISPOSITION OF ENROLLEES						
City	(N)	Completed In-School	Completed Graduated	Terminated In-School	Terminated Dropout	Terminated Graduated
Cleveland	(99)	45.5%	33.3%	5.1%	14.1%	2.0%
Colorado Springs	(41)	19.5	14.6	29.3	4.9	31.7
Eugene	(42)	26.2	21.4	23.8	19.0	9.5
Flint	(67)	22.4	20.9	22.4	9.0	25.4
Fort Worth	(63)	22.2	42.9	27.0	0.0	7.9
George- town	(25)	20.0	8.0	60.0	12.0	0.0
Las Vegas	(21)	4.8	57.1	19.0	0.0	19.0
Pitts- burgh	(70)	28.6	45.7	11.4	11.4	2.9
Pueblo	(41)	19.5	19.5	9.8	24.4	26.8
Salt Lake City	(122)	23.8	20.5	35.2	9.0	11.5
San Ber- nardino	(125)	41.6	8.0	37.6	7.2	5.6
VEPS-II Total	(716)	29.0	24.9	25.1	9.9	11.0
VEPS-I Total	(431)	46.9	16.2	25.1	9.7	2.1

lower than that experienced in VEPS-I (63.1%) and in MDTA programs in Fiscal Year 1972; 69.9% of all enrollees in MDTA programs completed the training, including 74.0% in institutional training and 62.5% in JOP-QJT (Manpower Report of the President, March, 1973, p. 230). Completion rates in Fiscal Year 1971 for MDTA programs were considerably lower. This lower completion rate in VEPS-II can be attributed to one factor: de-emphasis on rising juniors as a criterion for selection. As has already been noted, substantially more seniors participated in the VEPS-II program. The variance between the two VEPS groups in completion rates rests entirely upon terminators who remained in school and graduated. Thus, in overall terms, the selection of seniors coupled with a higher proclivity toward termination among seniors accounts for the variance between the two program groups. To bolster this interpretation, other data in the Table may be used. Terminations who remained in school compare exactly with the VEPS-I experience, and dropout rates are also quite similar (9.9% in VEPS-II and 9.7% in VEPS-I).

Program completion rates were highest in Cleveland (78.8%) and Pittsburgh (74.3%) and lowest in Georgetown (28.0%), Colorado Springs (34.1%) and Pueblo (39.0%). In only four of the eleven cities did a majority of youth complete the program. Seventy-one youth dropped out of school; these youth represent 9.9% of the total VEPS-II enrollees and 21.5% of terminations, compared to 9.7% of the VEPS-I enrollees and 26.4% of the terminations. The highest proportion of dropouts were in Pueblo, Eugene and Cleveland; no youth dropped out in either Fort Worth or Las Vegas.

As we noted in the final report on the VEPS-I program, it is difficult to assess with a strong degree of confidence the impact of VEPS upon dropout rates. The lack of empirical information, baseline data, or precise dropout figures for given years in school makes a comparative assessment impossible. The longitudinal study of the VEPS-I program which employs a control group should help to establish a meaningful indicator. Given the VEPS target population--probable high school dropouts--the rate of 9.9% can be interpreted in a favorable light. The comparability of this figure with the 9.7% in VEPS-I is also not without significance. Based on interpretation of available information reported in the VEPS-I final report, we conclude that, at worst, the dropout rate in the VEPS program is equal to or less than the rate for school populations as a whole and can only be interpreted as a substantial, qualitative improvement whose exact dimensions remain unknown.

C.2. Impact on Academic Performance. The counseling and remediation components of the VEPS design were partially intended to demonstrate the value of a sound high school preparation for the world of work. Effective counseling, it was thought, would result in improved grade performance among the enrollees. Since one of the indicators most commonly used in selecting probable dropouts was grade point average, substantial improvements were expected. This thought rested on the assumption that poor academic performance was a symptom of attitude and not actual ability. In Table 8, mean grade point averages were provided for beginning enrollees for the 1971-72 school year (indicative of pre-program performance levels) and for VEPS completers for the 1971-72 school year and the 1972-73 school year. No data are available for the enrollees in Eugene. Data reflect only those enrollees for whom complete academic information is available.

TABLE 8

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR 1971-72
AND 1972-73, BY CITY*

City	\bar{X} G.P.A. (1971-72)		\bar{X} G.P.A. (1972-73)		G.P.A. Change
	All Enrollees	(N)	Completers Only	(N)	
Cleveland	1.62	(95)	1.68	(77)	+0.62
Colorado Springs	2.34	(35)	2.43	(14)	+0.01
Flint	1.64	(67)	1.73	(29)	+0.18
Fort Worth	2.24	(62)	2.49	(37)	-0.14
Georgetown	1.84	(22)	2.16	(6)	-0.03
Las Vegas	2.73	(19)	2.48	(8)	+0.10
Pittsburgh	1.39	(63)	1.52	(52)	+0.45
Pueblo	1.87	(27)	2.01	(10)	+0.06
Salt Lake City	2.19	(118)	2.55	(54)	+0.16
San Bernar- dino	2.31	(105)	2.41	(59)	+0.03

*No data available for Eugene.

The impact of VEPS-II upon the grade point averages of completers is generally positive, but not nearly as dramatic as might be expected or desired; substantial improvement did occur in Cleveland and Pittsburgh. While averages rose in all but two cities, most of the change is marginal in terms of the individual program mean. It should be noted that, with the exception of Las Vegas, mean grade point averages of completers are higher than the mean for the total group of enrollees. As an overall indicator, the mean grade point change per completer in VEPS-II was +0.24; the comparable figure for VEPS-I was +0.237. The difference is suggestive of a constant program impact upon enrollee academic performance that is slight, but positive.

While indicators of overall change are useful, the impact of the program can be measured and assessed more directly in two ways: enumerating the numbers of youth whose grade point rose or fell absolutely and classifying that distribution among categories of degree. Such information is provided in Table 9.

The use of the direction and degree of change indicators reveals a somewhat more favorable impact. Students whose grade point average rose exceeded those whose average declined by a ratio of nearly two to one. Substantial majorities of youth in Cleveland, Colorado Springs, Georgetown, Las Vegas and Pittsburgh improved their averages. In no city did a majority decline, although a plurality declined in Fort Worth; the youth are evenly divided in Pueblo. In terms of degree of change, a near majority (46.7%) improved at least +0.26 grade points or better compared to 23.9% who declined -0.26 or more, a ratio of two to one. The ratio between opposite categories of the degree of change scale also reveals a ratio of two to one. Moreover, this distribution is quite comparable to the distribution found in the VEPS-I program. Thus, when mean grade point change, direction of change and degree of change are examined, the data consistently reveal a skewness toward improvement at a ratio of approximately two to one, a distribution which confirms estimated programmatic impact upon academic performance for VEPS-I.

C.3. Impact on Attendance in School. As with grade point averages, an implicit goal of the VEPS program was improved attendance patterns among enrollees. Attendance is commonly viewed as an indicator of student interest and attitude and is usually posited as having a positive correlation with academic performance. The data from VEPS-II (confirming that found in VEPS-I) do not support this contention; academic performance and attendance are not significantly related phenomena. Some distortion exists within the attendance data due to the varying techniques used by school systems in determining and reporting absences; the distortion occurs in the attempt to standardize attendance factors in terms of days absent. Some systems report absences in terms of days, others in class periods; it is not uncommon in some systems to report students as present (while their presence can be questioned) in order to increase per pupil daily attendance to qualify for increased state aid. It is our belief that, insofar as possible, these distortions have been minimized in the data presented here, although the reader is cautioned not to place excessive faith in the data.

TABLE 9

DIRECTION AND DEGREE OF GRADE POINT CHANGE FOR COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Grade Point Change Indicator		Clev.	Col.S.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>DIRECTION OF CHANGE</u>	(N)	(78)	(14)	(29)	(37)	(6)	(8)	(52)	(10)	(54)	(59)	(347)	(254)
Up		75.6%	71.4%	58.7%	29.7%	66.7%	75.0%	69.2%	50.0%	59.3%	59.3%	62.0%	61.5%
Same		7.7	0.0	3.4	24.3	0.0	12.5	5.8	0.0	1.9	0.0	6.0	3.1
Down		16.7	28.6	37.9	45.9	33.3	12.5	25.0	50.0	38.8	40.7	32.0	35.4
<u>DEGREE OF CHANGE</u>													
+1.26 or more		21.8%	0.0%	6.9%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	8.9%	9.1%
+0.76 to 1.25		23.1	0.0	10.3	13.5	0.0	0.0	23.1	0.0	11.1	10.2	14.4	12.2
+0.26 to 0.75		16.7	21.4	20.7	10.8	50.0	50.0	21.2	40.0	29.6	28.8	23.4	26.8
+0.25 to -0.25		24.3	50.0	38.0	21.6	16.7	37.5	17.3	40.0	33.3	37.2	29.4	28.3
-0.26 to -0.75		6.4	21.4	20.7	18.9	0.0	0.0	15.4	10.0	18.5	11.9	13.5	13.4
-0.76 to -1.25		5.1	0.0	3.4	21.6	33.3	12.5	1.9	10.0	5.6	10.2	7.8	7.5
-1.26 or more		2.6	7.2	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	2.6	2.8

When the data are controlled for city, the impact upon attendance is not great. Overall, absences per enrollee declined by less than one full day (0.85); in VEPS-I the comparable statistic is 1.44 days. In five of the ten cities attendance patterns improved, and in five cities attendance patterns deteriorated; however, the degree of change is slight. See Appendix Table D-3. In Pueblo and Fort Worth, enrollees averaged an improvement of seven days, while in Flint the enrollees averaged a deterioration of four days; in all other cities the difference between 1971-72 and 1972-73 attendance varied plus or minus three days or less. An objective interpretation of these data force the conclusion that the VEPS impact was non-existent in terms of attendance.

To further test this attendance outcome, data were controlled for both direction and degree of change to determine if any meaningful impact was being masked through use of aggregate data and measures of central tendency. The distribution may be found in Table 10. Less than half of the VEPS completers (48.8%) improved in attendance, although this constitutes a plurality of the youth. Some variation exists among the cities, but the distributions are not significant. The outcome data on attendance are also quite similar to that found in VEPS-I, which is again suggestive of a constant impact factor for the program upon enrollees that is slight, but positive.

When the data are controlled for degree of change, the general pattern resembles a normal curve; opposite points on the scale are approximately equal in value. Overall, 34.1% showed some improvement (+4 or more days attended), 32.8% showed no marked change (+3 to -3 days), and 33.1% demonstrated some decline (-4 or more days attended). Compared to VEPS-I, while there was less improvement in VEPS-II, there was also less decline; thus, the attendance pattern for VEPS-II shows somewhat more stability over the two year comparison.

These data demonstrate that attendance cannot be improved through a VEPS program acting alone. Conversations with counselors and enrollees brought out the observation that youth are "turned off school" for a variety of reasons; many counselors found that the youth were prone to skip school in favor of going to work, and where a no-school-no-work rule was not enforced, the tendency was for absences to increase. One might speculate that attendance in school is a function of individual enrollee attitude and situation which are amenable to intensive counseling. However, even where counseling components were above average, little impact can be observed. Attendance patterns, as a consequence, can only be judged as being influenced by factors other than counseling.

C.4. Improved Disciplinary Status. As was the case with VEPS-I, specific data on instances of disciplinary action are not available for tabulation, either for the baseline period of the 1971-72 academic year or the 1972-73 VEPS year. In some cities records of such action are not a part of the permanent student file; in others the information could not or would not be released or was scattered in several locations. Consequently, the CUP monitoring teams were forced to rely on counselor reports of individual cases and to draw such conclusions as might be possible from that partial information.

TABLE 10

DIRECTION AND DEGREE OF ATTENDANCE CHANGE FOR VEPS COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Attendance Change		Clev.	Col.S.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>DIRECTION OF CHANGE</u>	(N)	(77)	(14)	(29)	(36)	(3)	(7)	(51)	(8)	(29)	(39)	(293)	(244)
Up		49.3%	28.6%	34.5%	72.2%	66.7%	28.6%	51.0%	75.0%	51.7%	35.9%	48.8%	50.0%
Same		2.6	21.4	0.0	11.1	33.3	0.0	3.9	0.0	3.4	15.4	6.5	4.9
Down		48.1	50.0	65.5	16.7	0.0	71.4	45.1	25.0	44.8	48.7	44.7	45.1
<u>DEGREE OF CHANGE</u>													
+10 days or more		22.1%	0.0%	6.9%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	37.3%	37.5%	13.8%	7.7%	18.8%	26.2%
+4 to +9 days		22.1	21.4	20.7	13.9	0.0	14.3	3.9	25.0	17.2	10.3	15.3	13.5
+3 to -3 days		14.3	42.9	24.1	55.6	100.0	28.6	21.6	12.5	48.3	53.8	32.8	22.1
-4 to -9 days		15.6	21.4	27.6	5.6	0.0	57.1	9.8	12.5	6.9	12.8	14.3	13.1
-10 days or more		26.0	14.3	20.7	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.5	12.5	13.8	15.4	18.8	25.0

In all programs where other programmatic indicators suggested reliability of counselor reports, the general pre-VEPS condition was about what one would expect given the fact that enrollees were probable drop-outs--above average numbers of suspensions, transfers, inter-student conflicts, and confrontations with instructional personnel. The incidence of such problems appears to have been somewhat less frequent in VEPS-II than it had been in VEPS-I, probably due to the higher proportion of seniors among the enrollees. Over the course of the program only two known instances of police involvement took place, both having to do with drug related offenses. In several cases employers made thinly veiled charges that a youth employee had stolen either money or material from the worksite, but in no case could the fact be demonstrated and no charges were filed. Youth involved in these situations were usually transferred to another worksite, and in no case was more than one accusation made against any one youth. Suspensions from school occurred with a slightly higher frequency, although these cases generally involved inter-student confrontations rather than student-school personnel incidents. No evidence was obtained that would indicate any serious confrontations between VEPS enrollees and school system personnel.

On the contrary, in the opinion of VEPS counseling staffs and the small number of teachers with whom the monitoring teams came in contact, the impression was consistent that substantial improvement in behavior and attitude had occurred among VEPS enrollees. Conversations with enrollees indicated that a latent function of VEPS was to demonstrate to the youth that both NYC and school personnel were interested in their welfare and were willing to help. It should be remembered, however, that this improved attitude did not carry over into markedly improved academic performance and attendance. While many youth remained skeptical of the educational process, contact with the VEPS program evidently was instrumental in reducing both the direction and intensity of anti-school attitudes. Parents also indicated that the program had had observable effects upon their children; VEPS also provided an avenue for entry into the school system for parents with questions or problems about their children and the school.

The information presented above is admittedly scanty, impressionistic, and probably unreliable in some instances. Admittedly also, some problems of discipline and suspension did occur. But the impression is clear and the opinion widespread that youth who participated in the VEPS program did experience marked behavioral and attitudinal change for the better and that such change was reflected in an observable decrease in disciplinary actions.

C.5. Continued Private Sector Employment. Of equal or perhaps greater importance than academic improvement, a major VEPS objective was to provide a mechanism by which youth enrollees would, upon completion of the program, be retained full time by the private sector employers. For non-seniors, it was hoped that full time private sector employment would be found for the summer following the VEPS program, part time work during the senior year, and full time employment upon graduation. Other programmatic objectives--skill development and the maturation of realistic attitudes about school and the world of work--can be related to this objective. Youth who do mature and do develop skills are more likely to be retained by an employer or be able to secure other private sector employment. Table 11 provides data on final disposition of the VEPS completers--what happened to them upon termination of the VEPS year.

TABLE 11
FINAL DISPOSITION OF VEPS COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Final Disposition	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
(N)	(78)	(11)	(19)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(61)	(381)	(258)
Remained at VEPS Employer	69.2%	81.8%	42.1%	65.5%	46.3%	57.1%	92.3%	84.6%	50.0%	66.7%	82.0%	69.0%	37.2%
Other Private Sector Work	2.6	9.1	10.5	3.4	4.9	28.6	0.0	3.8	0.0	16.7	4.9	6.3	4.3
Higher Education	10.3	0.0	0.0	10.3	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.6	6.0	6.2
Returned to NYC	1.3	0.0	26.3	0.0	17.1	14.3	0.0	3.8	12.5	0.0	4.9	5.5	20.9
Military	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	12.5	0.0	1.6	2.4	2.3
Not Working	12.8	9.1	15.8	17.2	9.8	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0	8.4	4.3
Other	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	5.8	18.8	1.9	0.0	2.4	24.8*

*Includes all VEPS-I youth who were carried over into VEPS-II, 22.9% of the total; only 1.9% should be read as "other."

-61-

The extensive success of the VEPS-II program in attaining its employment objectives is clearly discernible from the data. Over two-thirds (69.0%) found full time private sector employment at the VEPS work station while an additional 6.3% found other private sector employment. This rate of 75.3% placement among completers is substantially higher than the 41.5% rate for the VEPS-I program. Substantially fewer completers returned to NYC and somewhat more were unemployed compared to VEPS-I, but both figures are largely a function of the higher incidence of seniors in VEPS-II. Although a higher proportion of the VEPS-II enrollees were seniors, the proportion going on to higher education is slightly less than that recorded among VEPS-I enrollees. Internal variations among cities are not significant.

Favorable programmatic outcomes (private sector, higher education, and military service) constitute 83.7% of the completers, compared to 50.0% of the VEPS-I enrollees. The private sector retention rate and the favorable outcome rate are undeniable indicators of programmatic impact. While the effect upon school related variables is slightly positive, the proof of the employment potential of the VEPS program is amply demonstrated by the data; it can only lead to the conclusion that VEPS is a significant modality for facilitating the movement of youth into the private sector. A further test of this potency is provided in Section C.6. below.

C.6. Facilitated the Transition from School to the Work Force.

The most direct test of the ability of the VEPS program to provide an expeditious means for facilitating the transition of high school students into the full-time work force is through an analysis of seniors who completed the program. The high unemployment rate among recent high school graduates, and teenagers generally, is well documented. VEPS was intended to be a partial remedy for the problems faced by this group in moving into the full-time labor force.

Slightly less than one-quarter (24.5%) of the VEPS-I enrollees were seniors; in VEPS-II, however, 48.7% of the original group of enrollees were seniors. Thus, the incidence of seniors was nearly double that of the first VEPS program. Of the 346 seniors who started the program, 204 completed (59.0%) and 179 graduated (51.7%). The graduation rate among completers was 87.7%.

Of the 179 seniors who completed and graduated, 106 (59.2%) were retained at the private sector VEPS work site; fifteen (8.4%) found other private sector work; and seven (3.9%) were employed full-time in the public sector.

The full-time employed rate among the 179 seniors, then, was a highly respectable 71.5%, compared to 56.1% in the VEPS-I program. Substantially fewer graduating seniors (9.5%) in VEPS-II went on to higher education; in VEPS-I over a quarter (28.0%) sought additional education. Another 4.5% of the VEPS-II youth joined the military (5.3% in VEPS-I) and 2.8% became housewives (5.3% in VEPS-I). Nineteen of the youth (10.6%) were not working, compared to an unemployment rate of 5.3% in VEPS-I. Two youth (1.1%) could not be accounted for.

In terms of favorable outcomes, therefore, when frequencies for full-time employment, higher education and military are combined, 85.5% of the

youth experienced a satisfactory programmatic outcome; no connotation is given to those who became married. This compares to an overall success score of 89.4% for VEPS-I. In both program years, then, the ability of the VEPS program to provide transitional means for movement from school into the full-time work force is amply demonstrated.

C.7. NYC and School System Personnel Opinions of VEPS. Enthusiastic support for the VEPS concept exists among all those programs operating over the past two years. In addition, other NYC programs in states or regions having a VEPS experiment have sought information, guidance, and operational authorizations to begin VEPS. The VEPS concept has been supported by local prime sponsors and comprehensive planning agencies of all sorts. Authorizations for VEPS appear in a number of state plans including Michigan, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, and California. As of February, 1974, CUP had been contacted by representatives of state agencies from Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota, Missouri, and Illinois. National meetings of NYC directors, professional guidance counselors, and other professional associations have devoted panels and discussions to the VEPS approach, and in each instance the reaction has been highly favorable.

Each of the program components--recruitment, counseling, guidance, career exploration, job development, cost sharing incentives--have been individually and collectively praised as a vehicle for surmounting many of the operational difficulties confronting public sector-only NYC programs. Las Vegas, for example, plans to allocate one-half of the NYC program to VEPS; many program directors have indicated a willingness to make VEPS the standard NYC program, using public sector work sites only when they constitute meaningful experiences with opportunity for full-time employment.

The most common opinion of VEPS personnel is that this program provides a coherent, total and effective approach to solving the problems of teenage unemployment among disadvantaged groups. The combination of public and private work sites, a counseling package, and adequate resources has, in their opinion, provided the opportunity for a comprehensive review of the philosophy and thrust of the NYC program generally.

D. Analysis of Completers and Terminators

Of the 716 youth enrolled in the VEPS-II program, 386 (53.9%) completed the full year program, and 330 (46.0%) terminated. While the completion rate for VEPS-II is nine percentage points below that of VEPS-I, part of this can be attributed to the fact that sponsors of VEPS-II programs were allowed to replace enrollees as they terminated. Those replacements often terminated as well, and thus the overall termination rate went up. As a summary, it can be noted that males were more likely to complete the program than were females. This represents the reverse of the VEPS-I program. Enrollees seventeen years of age or older completed at a higher rate than did younger youth. Blacks completed at a higher rate than did other ethnic groups. In general, enrollees who finished the program had more formal education than did those who terminated. Table 14 presents selected demographic characteristics for the universe, completers, and terminators. The same information controlled for city can be found in the Appendix (Table D-4).

TABLE 12

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VEPS
UNIVERSE, COMPLETERS, AND TERMINATORS

Demographic Characteristics		Universe	Completers	Terminators
<u>SEX</u>	(N)	(716)	(386)	(330)
Male		52.1%	53.1%	50.9%
Female		47.9	46.9	49.1
<u>AGE</u>	(N)	(709)	(383)	(326)
15 or younger		15.4%	13.3%	17.8%
16 years		37.9	37.9	38.0
17 years		35.3	37.1	33.1
18 or older		11.4	11.7	11.0
<u>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</u>	(N)	(715)	(386)	(329)
Black		45.0%	50.5%	38.6%
White		33.3	30.8	36.2
Spanish Surname		20.8	18.1	24.0
Other		0.8	0.5	1.2
<u>SCHOOL YEAR</u>	(N)	(710)	(386)	(324)
Freshman		1.5%	1.6%	1.5%
Sophomore		9.7	9.1	10.5
Junior		40.0	36.5	44.1
Senior		48.7	52.8	43.8

Of the 386 youth who completed VEPS-II, 53.1% were male. Of the 330 youth who terminated, 50.9% were male. In other words, males were more likely to complete the program than were females. For males the completion rate was 55.2%; for females the rate was 52.8%. Inter-city comparisons follow the same general pattern but do show some differences. In Cleveland, Eugene, Georgetown, and Pittsburgh, females were more likely to complete. However, only in Georgetown is there a major deviation from the general trend.

Age comparisons also exhibit only marginal differences. While virtually the same proportion of completers and terminators are age sixteen (37.9% and 38.0%), those over sixteen account for 48.8% of completers but only 44.1% of the terminators. The completion rate for youth over sixteen is 56.5% while for those under sixteen it is 46.8%. This would indicate a better chance for older youth to complete the program. The tendency for younger youth to terminate is most evident in Eugene and San Bernardino.

As in the case of the VEPS-I, ethnic background is a more discriminatory factor than either age or sex in comparing completions and terminations. As Table 12 indicates, blacks are more likely to complete than whites or those with Spanish surnames. While blacks comprise 45.0% of the universe, they account for just over half (50.5%) of the completions but only 38.6% of the terminations. The completion rate among blacks was 60.8%, a full ten percentage points above whites (50.0%). For those with Spanish surnames the completion rate was 47.0%.

Enrollees who had completed their junior year had the highest rate of completion (59.0%). However, a rather strange phenomenon appears when discussing other enrollees: among those in their junior year, only 49.6% completed the program, while for those with less schooling the completion rate was 51.3%. (It must be remembered, however, that only 10% of all enrollees fall in this latter category.) Among completers, 52.8% were in their senior year; among terminators, 43.8% were in their last year of high school. City comparisons show much the same pattern.

Enrollees who completed the program were likely to be single and live in female-headed households in which there was substantial unemployment. Over half contributed to the support of their family and received some form of public assistance (53.5% and 51.3%). Less than one-fifth (19.5%) live in public housing. Terminators are also likely to be single and live in female-headed households with substantial unemployment. However, among terminators there is a greater incidence of full-time employment by the family head. Terminators are less likely than completers to contribute to the support of the family, to live in public housing or to receive any form of welfare. Table 13 presents these characteristics in greater detail; Appendix Table D-5 contains similar data controlled by city.

Almost half (49.7%) of all enrollees live in households headed by the youth's mother; no difference appears when controlling for completion or termination. Among those who live with both parents or with their father,

TABLE 13

SELECTED FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VEPS
UNIVERSE, COMPLETERS, AND TERMINATORS

Family Characteristics		Universe	Completers	Terminators
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>	(N)	(662)	(367)	(295)
Single		98.5%	99.5%	97.3%
Married		1.4	0.5	2.4
Divorced		0.1	0.0	0.1
<u>LIVES WITH</u>	(N)	(606)	(343)	(263)
Both Parents		37.1%	38.2%	35.7%
Father		3.0	3.5	2.3
Mother		49.7	49.9	49.4
Guardian		5.3	4.4	6.5
Other		4.9	4.1	6.1
<u>HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD</u>	(N)	(620)	(350)	(270)
Father		39.8%	42.0%	37.0%
Mother		49.7	49.4	50.0
Other		10.6	8.6	13.0
<u>EMPLOYMENT OF HEAD</u>	(N)	(553)	(303)	(250)
Full-time		28.6%	26.1%	31.6%
35 hours or less		15.4	16.2	14.4
Unemployed		56.0	57.8	54.0
<u>CONTRIBUTES TO FAMILY SUPPORT</u>	(N)	(536)	(299)	(237)
Yes		47.2%	53.2%	39.7%
No		52.8	46.8	60.3
<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>	(N)	(534)	(297)	(237)
Yes		17.4%	19.5%	14.8%
No		82.6	80.5	85.2
<u>WELFARE ASSISTANCE</u>	(N)	(662)	(359)	(303)
Yes		47.9%	51.3%	43.9%
No		52.1	48.7	56.1

there is a slightly increased rate of completion. Among completers, 42.0% came from households headed by the father; among terminators only 37.0% lived with their father. Unemployment and part-time employment (less than 35 hours a week) both were lower among terminators than among completers. Full-time family employment was higher among terminators than among completers (31.6% to 26.1%). Part-time employment shows just the reverse; 14.4% among terminators, 16.5% among completers. The family head was employed (part or full-time) in 42.3% of completion cases and in 46.0% of termination cases. Unemployment was substantial; 57.8% among completers, 54.0% among terminators. Given this high rate of unemployment, plus the fact that 52.1% of all enrollees received no form of welfare assistance, it is somewhat surprising that the program completion rate was as high as it was.

Also given the high rate of unemployment, it is surprising that less than half of the youth contribute to the support of their family. When controlled for program disposition, completers were more likely to contribute support than were terminators. Part of this may be explained by the fact of substantial unemployment in many areas studied (thus offering the youth fewer opportunities for part-time work); another part of the explanation may be that some youth are already trapped by the "culture of poverty" and thus have already given up on the world of work.

Given the extent of un- and underemployment, it might be expected that many enrollees would reside in public housing. (Among completers it is 19.5%; among terminators, 14.8%). The explanation lies in the availability of public housing; many of the cities studied had little or no public housing. Again given the fact that 56.0% of household heads were unemployed, it is somewhat surprising that only 47.9% of these households received any form of welfare assistance.

Among all youth in the VEPS-II program, 74.6% had some previous work experience. When controlling for program disposition the figure is exactly the same; 74.6% of completers and 74.6% of terminators had previously worked. Table 14 presents this data for all enrollees, for completers and for terminators. While many enrollees had work experience, few were employed at the time of enrolling for the VEPS-II program year. Substantially more youth who completed the program were employed at the time of enrollment than were youth who terminated; 12.1% to 5.6%. This may partially be explained by the fact that in a number of cities (e.g., Flint and Pittsburgh) youth who completed VEPS-I were carried over into the second year program. Although we have no precise figures to offer, interviews with program sponsors and counselors leads us to believe that much of the previous work experience was in a regular NYC public sector job. Just under two-thirds (66.1%) of those who completed and just over two-thirds (67.2%) of those who terminated, had held a job for thirty days or more previous to VEPS. In terms of previous employment history, there is little difference between completers and terminators.

While a larger percentage of completers were working at the time of enrollment, this is at least partially explained by the fact that some cities

TABLE 14

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VEPS
UNIVERSE, COMPLETERS, AND TERMINATORS

Employment History		Universe	Completers	Terminators
<u>EVER WORKED</u>	(N)	(622)	(350)	(272)
Yes		74.6%	74.6%	74.6%
No		25.4	25.4	25.4
<u>PRESENTLY WORKING</u>	(N)	(561)	(313)	(248)
Yes		9.3%	12.1%	5.6%
No		62.6	59.4	66.5
Never Worked		28.2	28.4	27.8
<u>HELD A JOB OVER 30 DAYS</u>	(N)	(583)	(327)	(256)
Yes		66.5%	66.1%	67.2%
No		6.3	6.7	5.9
Never Worked		27.1	27.2	27.0

TABLE 15

VEPS WORK EXPERIENCE FOR THE VEPS
UNIVERSE, COMPLETERS, AND TERMINATORS

VEPS Work Experience		Universe	Completers	Terminators
<u>SIZE OF EMPLOYER</u>	(N)	(691)	(384)	(307)
1-4		23.7%	21.3%	26.7%
5-9		21.1	18.5	24.4
10-19		22.3	22.6	21.8
20-29		11.1	12.8	9.1
30-49		7.7	7.5	7.8
50-99		4.0	4.9	2.9
100 plus		10.0	12.2	7.2
<u>TYPE OF WORK EXPERIENCE</u>	(N)	(716)	(386)	(330)
Professional		1.0%	1.0%	0.9%
Manager		0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales		10.7	12.4	8.8
Clerical		26.8	29.5	23.6
Craftsman		6.3	5.2	7.6
Operative		18.3	19.4	17.0
Laborer		13.4	13.2	13.6
Service		20.0	18.6	21.5
Never Worked in VEPS		3.5	0.5	7.0
<u>NUMBER OF WORK EXPERIENCES</u>	(N)	(691)	(384)	(307)
One		69.2%	64.1%	75.6%
Two		25.9	29.2	21.8
Three		4.9	6.8	2.6

carried youth over from VEPS-I into VEPS-II. (See Appendix Table D-6). Flint (51.7%), Fort Worth (51.2%) and Salt Lake City (56.8%) were the only cities in which less than 60% of the completers had some previous work experience. In seven cities (Flint, Fort Worth, Georgetown, Pittsburgh, Pueblo, Salt Lake City and San Bernardino) a higher percentage of terminators than completers had previous work experience. Eugene and Las Vegas present cases slightly different from the others. In Eugene 72.7% of the completers had previously worked while only 43.8% of the terminators had; in Las Vegas 69.5% of the completers and only 42.9% of the terminators had ever held a job. In Eugene, Fort Worth and Las Vegas no enrollee was working at the time VEPS-II began. Also, in these three cities plus Pueblo, all youth who had job experience had held a job for thirty days.

Table 15 presents information on the size of the VEPS-II work site and the type of training received by the enrollees. As can be seen, most job sites were quite small: 23.7% had less than five employees; 44.8% less than ten; and 67.1% less than twenty. Among completers 62.4% worked at sites having fewer than twenty employees; among terminators 72.9% fell in that category. Although there were few enrollees at large job sites, the completion rate is slightly better at these locations. While only 10% of enrollees were at sites having 100 or more employees; 12.2% of the completers were at such sites. In the 50-99 employees category, 4.0% of all youth held jobs; among completers 4.9% were at these sites. Since less than one in seven youth held jobs at sites with fifty or more employees, no conclusion should be drawn about site size and completion rate. Counselors insist that the smaller the job site, the greater the probability of success. What appears is that most jobs were developed with small employers; it is highest in the under five (23.7%) full-time employees category. The highest rate of terminators (26.7%) is also found in that category. The rate of completion does not seem to be statistically related to the number of employees. While more jobs were developed with small employers (and in many cities, it was easier), the rate of success is not dependent on job size.

Work experience for completers does not differ significantly from non-completers; a few more completers are found in the clerical and sales category; a few more terminators had service jobs, but the differences are not statistically significant. Most (69.2%) youth had only one work experience; 25.9% had two and 4.9% three or more different work experiences. Completers were a bit more likely to have more than one work experience. More than a third (36.0%) had two or more work experiences; only a fourth (24.4%) of terminators had more than one work experience. While there is no statistical evidence to suggest that having more than one work experience increases program completion, differences between completers and non-completers on this scale indicate that having more than one work experience could be a favorable factor.

It was hoped that the VEPS experience would have a favorable impact upon enrollee academic performance. To a limited degree such was the case. Table 16 indicates that 62.0% of completers improved their grade point average, while only 50.8% of terminators improved. At the other end, 32.0% of completers

TABLE 16

ACADEMIC IMPACT DATA ON THE VEPS
UNIVERSE, COMPLETERS, AND TERMINATORS

Academic Indicator		Universe	Completers	Terminators
<u>G.P.A. CHANGE</u>	(N)	(542)	(347)	(195)
Up		57.9%	62.0%	50.8%
Same		6.3	6.0	6.7
Down		35.8	32.0	42.6
<u>SUMMARY SCALE</u>	(N)	(542)	(347)	(195)
+1.26 or better		6.6%	8.9%	2.6%
+0.76 to +1.25		14.6	14.4	14.9
+0.26 to +0.75		21.9	23.3	18.5
+0.25 to -0.25		31.2	29.3	34.4
-0.26 to -0.75		14.6	13.5	17.4
-0.76 to -1.25		7.9	7.8	8.2
-1.26 or worse		3.1	2.6	4.1
<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	(N)	(440)	(293)	(147)
Up		47.9%	48.8%	46.2%
Same		7.9	6.5	10.9
Down		44.1	44.7	42.9
<u>SUMMARY SCALE</u>	(N)	(440)	(293)	(147)
+10 days or more		19.1%	18.8%	19.7%
+4 to +9 days		14.8	15.3	13.6
+3 to -3 days		33.4	32.8	34.7
-4 to -9 days		14.1	14.3	13.6
-10 days or more		18.6	18.8	18.4

declined in grade point average, but 42.6% of terminators declined. This was a slight improvement over the VEPS-I program experience. The highest rate of improvement among completers was in Cleveland where 75.6% improved academically. Colorado Springs, Georgetown, Las Vegas and Pittsburgh each had two-thirds or more completers improve G.P.A. Every city had at least half of the completers improving. Dramatic improvement (+1.26 or better) occurred among 8.9% of those who finished the program. Most of these youth were in Cleveland and Pittsburgh. In fact 83.9% of completers who achieved this degree of improvement come from these two cities. Both of these cities followed the program guidelines very closely. The point made in the VEPS-I report bears repeating here: improvement in grade point average demonstrates that given intensive counseling and supervision, VEPS can be a very successful program. Overall 46.7% of all completers improved academic performance by one quarter of a grade point or better, while only 23.9% declined a quarter point or more. Among terminators 36.9% improved and 28.7% declined by one quarter of a point or more. In Colorado Springs (60.0%), Fort Worth (63.6%), Las Vegas (66.7%) and San Bernardino (53.8%) more terminators declined than improved or stayed the same academically. Cleveland presents a most unusual case: among terminators 14.3% improved academically; 28.6% declined but 57.1% remained the same.

In summary, academic performance, as measured by grade point average, was more likely to improve and less likely to decline among VEPS completers than among terminators.

While more than sixty percent of the youth who completed the program improved academic performance, less than half (48.8%) improved their school attendance. Attendance improvement was most dramatic in Fort Worth and Pueblo where 72.2% and 75.0% of the enrollees who completed the program improved school attendance. In Colorado Springs, Cleveland, Flint, Las Vegas, and San Bernardino less than half of the completers improved school attendance. In Pueblo 37.5% improved by ten days or more; 62.5% by four days or more. Among those who terminated 46.2% improved and 42.9% declined in school attendance. Where there was attendance improvement among terminators it was not as great as the improvement shown by completers. Overall, however, no real difference can be shown by completers and terminators in the area of school attendance.

In summary, while there is some relationship between program completers on improved grades, there appears to be no relationship between program completion and improved attendance.

Much has been written arguing that academic performance is partly a function of age and grade in school: the older and further along in school a youth is, the better his performance is likely to be. As can be seen upon inspection of Table 17, both the universe of VEPS enrollees and VEPS completers generally follow the expected pattern. Among all youth those over sixteen improved their grade point average more often than did those who were sixteen. The sixteen year olds improved more often than did those who were under sixteen. The differences among these categories is not dramatic, but it does run in the expected direction. When inspecting the data on completers, however, a possible counter-trend is noticed. Two-thirds of the completers under sixteen improved academically; this is higher than any other age category. Before attempting to draw any conclusions, it should be noted that

TABLE 17

DIRECTION OF G.P.A. CHANGE BY DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS FOR VEPS UNIVERSE AND COMPLETERS

Demographic Characteristics	(N)	UNIVERSE			(N)	COMPLETERS		
		Up	Same	Down		Up	Same	Down
<u>SEX</u>	(542)	(314)	(34)	(194)	(347)	(215)	(21)	(111)
Male	(268)	57.1%	6.3%	36.6%	(180)	60.6%	5.6%	33.9%
Female	(274)	58.8	6.2	35.0	(167)	63.5	6.6	29.9
<u>AGE</u>	(537)	(310)	(33)	(194)	(344)	(212)	(21)	(111)
Under 16	(73)	56.2%	5.5%	38.4%	(45)	66.7%	6.7%	26.7%
16	(209)	57.4	4.3	38.3	(133)	56.4	4.5	39.1
Over 16	(255)	58.4	7.8	33.7	(166)	64.5	7.2	28.3
<u>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</u>	(537)	(310)	(34)	(193)	(345)	(214)	(21)	(110)
Black	(276)	60.1%	8.0%	31.9%	(189)	63.0%	9.0%	28.0%
White	(155)	58.1	5.2	36.8	(95)	64.2	3.2	32.6
Spanish	(106)	50.9	3.8	45.3	(61)	55.7	1.6	42.6
<u>GRADE IN SCHOOL</u>	(541)	(314)	(34)	(193)	(347)	(215)	(21)	(111)
Freshman	(7)	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	(5)	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Sophomore	(45)	48.9	13.3	37.8	(33)	54.5	12.1	33.3
Junior	(116)	57.4	2.8	39.8	(132)	59.1	2.3	38.6
Senior	(273)	59.7	7.7	32.6	(177)	65.5	7.3	27.1

-73-

there are few (45) cases in this under sixteen category. What should be compared is the effect of program completion upon academic performance. While roughly the same proportion of sixteen year old completers improved G.P.A. as did all sixteen year old enrollees, in the other two categories (under sixteen and over sixteen) a much higher proportion of completers improved their academic performance. With the exception of freshmen, grade in school followed the expected pattern (there were only seven freshmen in the universe, five of whom completed the program, too small a cell to have any analytic significance). While seniors (59.7%) improved more often than juniors (57.4%) who in turn improved more often than sophomores (48.9%), those who completed improved at a more dramatic rate. Whereas 59.7% of all seniors improved academically; 65.5% of senior completers improved; for juniors the rates were 57.4% and 59.1%. The VEPS experience had a positive effect on academic performance over and above what would be expected by advancing grade, as can be seen by comparing universe and completer data. It must be concluded that the program did have a positive impact on G.P.A., especially if the target population for the program is taken into consideration.

Earlier in this section we noted that blacks were more likely to complete the program than were whites. Table 17 also indicates that all groups were subject to a positive impact by virtue of completing the program, the impact was more noticeable in the case of whites. Among blacks, 63.0% of completers improved grade point average as compared with 60.1% of all blacks. For whites 64.2% of the completers improved academically compared with a white universe figure of 58.1%. Both male and female completers improved more often than did those in the universe. The impact was slightly greater upon female completers than upon male completers. In summary, the VEPS-II program had a positive impact on academic improvement even when controlling for age, sex, grade in school and ethnic background.

Going beyond program completion and academic improvement, can a relationship be established between type of VEPS job or size of VEPS employer and academic improvement? Except in the craft and operative categories, Table 18 indicates that completers in all other categories show greater academic improvement than that found among all enrollees. (The professional category is excluded because it contains so few cases.) The greatest average improvement for both groups is seen in the sales and clerical categories. The largest differences between completers and the universe are also found in these categories. Completed youth who held sales jobs improved at a 75.6% rate; among all youth it was 67.2%. Completed youth who held clerical jobs improved at a 68.0% rate, while among all youth it was 61.2%. Completers who had craft jobs were less likely to improve than craftsmen in the universe.

The likelihood of academic improvement was highest among enrollees who had a job with very small employers (less than five employees) or quite large (50 plus) employers. In all categories of site size, completers improved more often than did all enrollees. In short there does not appear to be any direct relationship between academic improvement and VEPS work experience or size of VEPS employer. What appears is that the program itself, the whole program, has the positive impact on grades rather than the work experience component.

TABLE 18

DIRECTION OF G.P.A. CHANGE, BY VEPS WORK
EXPERIENCE FOR VEPS UNIVERSE AND COMPLETERS

VEPS Work Experience	(N)	UNIVERSE			(N)	COMPLETERS		
		Up	Same	Down		Up	Same	Down
<u>TYPE OF WORK</u>	(533)	(313)	(31)	(189)	(347)	(215)	(21)	(111)
Professional	(7)	28.6%	0.0%	71.4%	(4)	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%
Manager	(0)	--	--	--	(0)	--	--	--
Sales	(64)	67.2	4.7	28.1	(45)	75.6	4.4	20.0
Clerical	(152)	61.2	5.3	33.6	(100)	68.0	5.0	27.0
Craftsman	(28)	57.1	3.6	39.3	(17)	52.9	5.9	41.2
Operative	(98)	53.1	7.1	39.8	(67)	52.2	6.0	41.8
Laborer	(71)	54.9	5.6	39.4	(46)	58.7	6.5	34.8
Service	(113)	60.2	7.1	32.7	(68)	60.3	8.8	30.9
<u>SIZE OF EMPLOYER</u>	(533)	(313)	(31)	(189)	(347)	(215)	(21)	(111)
1-4	(120)	60.8%	5.0%	34.2%	(71)	62.0%	2.8%	35.2%
5-9	(110)	56.4	5.5	38.2	(64)	59.4	7.8	32.8
10-19	(125)	53.6	8.0	38.4	(81)	55.6	8.6	35.8
20-29	(63)	55.6	6.3	38.1	(45)	57.8	6.7	35.6
30-49	(39)	59.0	0.0	41.0	(26)	61.5	0.0	38.5
50-99	(21)	71.4	9.5	19.0	(18)	72.2	5.6	22.2
100 plus	(55)	69.1	5.5	25.5	(42)	78.6	7.1	14.3

-75-

TABLE 19

DIRECTION OF ATTENDANCE CHANGE BY DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS FOR VEPS UNIVERSE AND COMPLETERS

Demographic Characteristics	(N)	UNIVERSE			(N)	COMPLETERS		
		Up	Same	Down		Up	Same	Down
<u>SEX</u>	(440)	(211)	(35)	(194)	(293)	(143)	(19)	(131)
Male	(219)	43.4%	10.0%	46.6%	(157)	45.9%	8.3%	45.9%
Female	(221)	52.5	5.9	41.6	(136)	52.2	4.4	43.4
<u>AGE</u>	(435)	(206)	(35)	(194)	(290)	(140)	(19)	(131)
Under 16	(50)	48.0%	8.0%	44.0%	(29)	44.8%	6.9%	48.3%
16	(165)	41.2	10.9	47.9	(111)	41.4	9.9	48.6
Over 16	(220)	51.8	5.9	42.3	(150)	54.0	4.0	42.0
<u>ETHNIC</u>	(436)	(209)	(35)	(192)	(292)	(142)	(19)	(131)
Black	(260)	48.8%	6.9%	44.2%	(183)	47.5%	6.6%	45.9%
White	(105)	45.7	8.6	45.7	(65)	47.7	4.6	47.7
Spanish	(71)	47.9	11.3	40.8	(44)	54.5	9.1	36.4
<u>GRADE IN SCHOOL</u>	(439)	(211)	(35)	(193)	(293)	(143)	(19)	(131)
Freshman	(6)	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	(4)	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%
Sophomore	(35)	25.7	8.6	65.7	(26)	23.1	3.8	73.1
Junior	(164)	46.3	9.8	43.9	(103)	46.6	8.7	44.7
Senior	(234)	53.0	6.8	40.2	(160)	55.0	5.6	39.4

TABLE 20

DIRECTION OF ATTENDANCE CHANGE, BY VEPS WORK
EXPERIENCE FOR VEPS UNIVERSE AND COMPLETERS

VEPS Work Experience	(N)	UNIVERSE			(N)	COMPLETERS		
		Up	Same	Down		Up	Same	Down
<u>TYPE OF WORK</u>	(433)	(208)	(34)	(191)	(293)	(143)	(19)	(131)
Professional	(4)	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	(2)	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Manager	(0)	--	--	--	(0)	--	--	--
Sales	(47)	48.9	4.3	46.8	(37)	48.6	2.7	48.6
Clerical	(123)	45.5	7.3	47.2	(80)	46.3	7.5	46.3
Craftsman	(23)	69.6	4.3	26.1	(15)	73.3	0.0	26.7
Operative	(73)	49.3	8.2	42.5	(54)	50.0	9.3	40.7
Laborer	(64)	43.8	10.9	45.3	(44)	45.5	9.1	45.5
Service	(99)	48.5	8.1	43.4	(61)	47.5	4.9	47.5
<u>SIZE OF EMPLOYER</u>	(433)	(208)	(34)	(191)	(293)	(143)	(19)	(131)
1-4	(91)	44.0%	8.8%	47.3%	(60)	48.3%	6.7%	45.0%
5-9	(93)	51.6	7.5	40.9	(54)	46.3	11.1	42.6
10-19	(100)	38.0	11.0	51.0	(67)	40.3	4.5	55.2
20-29	(61)	59.0	4.9	36.1	(44)	65.9	4.5	29.5
30-49	(25)	64.0	0.0	36.0	(17)	52.9	0.0	47.1
50-99	(13)	46.2	23.1	30.8	(12)	50.0	16.7	33.3
100 plus	(50)	48.0	4.0	48.0	(39)	46.2	5.1	48.7

TABLE 21

REASONS GIVEN FOR TERMINATION OF VEPS ENROLLEES, BY CITY

Reason for Termination	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
(N)	(21)	(27)	(11)	(38)	(22)	(18)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(63)	(319)	(156)
Laid off, fired, quit	4.8%	26.9%	18.2%	47.4%	18.2%	44.4%	12.5%	38.9%	12.0%	10.3%	27.0%	23.4%	7.8%
School Dropout	66.7	7.8	36.4	15.8	0.0	16.7	0.0	44.4	40.0	16.2	14.3	21.6	26.9
Other Private													
Sector Job	0.0	15.4	18.2	5.3	18.2	5.5	50.0	0.0	8.0	11.8	7.9	10.3	17.3
Not Interested	9.5	7.8	4.5	7.9	13.6	0.0	12.5	0.0	4.0	14.7	4.8	7.9	5.8
Conflict with School													
Activities	9.5	3.8	4.5	2.6	4.5	5.5	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.4	9.5	5.2	1.3
Moved	0.0	3.8	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	4.4	7.9	4.6	6.4
Affected Academic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	13.2	1.6	4.6	1.9
Unknown	0.0	11.5	0.0	7.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	5.9	0.0	3.9	--
Married	0.0	3.8	4.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	5.6	4.0	5.9	3.2	3.3	3.2
Transportation													
Problem	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	2.7	1.9
To NYC at own													
Request	0.0	3.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	8.0	2.9	3.2	2.7	2.6
Involuntary Move to													
NYC	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	2.4	9.6
NYC Ineligible	0.0	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.9	3.2	2.1	1.9
Pregnant	4.8	3.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	7.0
Illness	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.2	1.5	3.8
Never Worked	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.2	1.9
Incarcerated	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.6	0.9	0.6

School attendance data controlled for demographic factors is shown in Table 19. Older, more advanced students are believed to improve school attendance; our data seems to bear this out. Those over sixteen improve more dramatically than do those sixteen. (Those under sixteen are discounted because so few youth appear in that category). Seniors are more likely to improve. It should be noted that only among those over sixteen and among seniors do over half of the enrollees improve attendance, and here it is only slightly over half. What really emerges is that youth are about as likely to decline in school attendance as to improve it. Completers do a little better than all enrollees but the differences are neither striking nor significant.

Looking at ethnic data, there is virtually no difference among blacks, whites and those with Spanish surnames. Blacks improve at a very slightly higher rate than do whites, but the difference is not meaningful. Except for those with Spanish surnames, there is no difference between completers and the universe. Black and white completers improve at virtually the same rate; although females improve attendance more often than do males, there is no difference in improvement rates between completers and all enrollees. In summary, there is no correlation between the VEPS program and changes in school attendance patterns.

Is there, however, a discernable relationship between type of VEPS work experience or size of VEPS employer and improved school attendance? Table 20 presents data on this question. Excluding the very small professional category, those youth who held craft positions improved substantially; 69.6% of all youth and 73.3% of completers in this category improved their school attendance. In no other job category did over half the enrollees improve their school attendance. This is true for the universe and for completers. In short, there appears to be no relationship between work experience and attendance pattern change.

When examining size of employer, youth placed with medium sized (twenty to fifty) employees were more likely to improve than those with the smaller or larger employers. Among completers improvement is most pronounced in the twenty to twenty-nine employees size. Here also, however, there does not appear to be any important relationship between work experience or size of employer and school attendance.

E. Reasons for Terminating VEPS

As was described in preceding sections, youth who terminated the VEPS program were disproportionately younger, white or Spanish surname, and juniors. Some variation by sex was noted; youth coming from female headed households did not show any greater tendency to terminate. Family circumstances with regard to employment and public assistance did show some variation. There was a higher tendency to terminate among those youth whose household head was employed full time, who did not contribute to the support of the family, and whose family was not receiving public assistance. Stated differently, those youth who contributed to family support or whose family received public assistance or whose head was under or unemployed were less prone to terminate. The economic necessity of the youth's income is probably a factor

in this tendency. Terminators were less likely to improve their grade point averages, and no difference between completers and terminators could be found in attendance. The size of employer and type of work assignment also appear unrelated to a decision to terminate.

In Table 21 the reasons given for termination are provided; as before, summary VEPS-I data are also provided for inter-program comparison. In VEPS-II, substantially more youth were laid off, fired, or quit; a three-fold increase over VEPS-I. This statistic may be explained by the tendency in many programs to let a youth go who was laid off; part of this was due to a scarcity of job site alternates. Fewer youth terminated in VEPS-II due to the availability of full time work, although this accounts for 10.6% of the terminations. Termination due to dropping out of school was less frequent in VEPS-II than in VEPS-I. The remaining distributions consist of small percentages and indicate no substantial variation. More aggressive counseling and job development in certain cities would have substantially reduced the number of terminations. In certain of the cities with high percentages of terminations due to youth being laid off, high unemployment rates were already the case, and the availability of work sites, despite the wage sharing incentive, was quite restricted. In these cases not much could be done.

In an overall sense the large number of terminations projects a somewhat unfavorable image upon the program, but by pursuing the reasons for termination, it can be seen that many youth abandoned VEPS for what might be considered valid reasons. In approximately one-third of the cases (31.6%) terminations were based on finding another private sector job, conflict with school activities, moving, adverse affect on academic performance, transportation problems, transferring to NYC at the youth's request, and illness.

When the data are controlled for size of employer and type of work experience in VEPS (if any), no meaningful associations are apparent. See Appendix Tables D-8 through D-14. In essence, then, we conclude that neither the size of employer nor the type of work which the enrollee experienced were factors in a decision to terminate. The answer probably lies in the area of individual attitude, motivation, or absence of effective counseling.

F. School Dropouts and VEPS

Seventy-one of the original 716 VEPS enrollees (9.9%) dropped out of school and, therefore, did not complete the full year program. This rate compares favorably with the data reported in other studies of school dropouts, and may, in fact, represent a sizable improvement. This speculation is difficult to verify due to the absence of directly comparable baseline data. Because of the small number of cases involved, cross tabulations and between-group comparisons are unable to reveal significant relationships or differences. Consequently, marginal frequencies of dropout characteristics are presented and contrasted only with the universe of all VEPS enrollees. Tabular presentations may be found in Appendix Tables D-15 through D-17.

Two cities--Fort Worth and Las Vegas--experienced no dropouts among the original group of enrollees; dropout rates varied considerably among the other nine intensively studied cities: Pueblo - 24.4%; Eugene - 19.0%; Cleveland - 14.1%; Georgetown - 12.0%; Pittsburgh - 11.4%; Flint and Salt Lake City - 9.0%; San Bernardino - 7.2%; and Colorado Springs - 4.9%. With some exceptions dropouts were less frequent in those cities which utilized extensive and intensive counseling programs, regardless of the degree to which the probable dropout guideline was implemented. Those cities which did adhere more closely to the guideline also experienced a slightly higher tendency toward dropouts, but the quality of the counseling mitigated the overall frequency.

CUP monitoring teams were able to isolate specific reasons for dropping out of school in fifty-four of the seventy-one cases. Ten youth (18.5%) accepted full time employment while an equal number were married. Eight youth (14.8%) joined the armed services, five (9.3%) became pregnant, and three (5.6%) ran away from home. Other reasons accounted for eighteen dropouts (33.3%), but the reasons did not aggregate into meaningful categories; for the most part, the reason ascertained or given was that the youth simply stopped coming to school and no follow-up contact could be made.

There was a greater tendency among males to drop out of school; 60.6% of the dropouts were male, although males comprised only 52.1% of the total enrollees. Slightly higher proportions of sixteen and eighteen year olds terminated their education, and slightly lower proportions of fifteen and seventeen year olds when compared to the characteristics of the original group. Fewer blacks dropped out than their numbers would have indicated; blacks constituted 47.9% of the total but only 39.4% of the dropouts. Youth with Spanish surnames were substantially more prone to quit school; 26.8% of the dropouts had Spanish surnames, while they totaled only 18.1% of the total group of enrollees. Enrollees in the sophomore and senior years were also more likely to drop out, but juniors were decidedly less prone. The senior statistic (31.9% of the dropouts but only 24.5% of the group) is somewhat surprising, since it has been commonly argued that youth who have reached the senior year have demonstrated a commitment to education, and that the dropout problem was thought to be more common among sophomores and juniors. While nearly half of the dropouts were juniors, the incidence is not reflective of their size in the program. The number of cases is too small for meaningful correlations, but there appears to be a tendency for sophomores, who are over age sixteen, to be the most prone to drop out. This is logical given the fact that the youth is likely to be behind his peer group in school and is confronted with the prospect of three years of education, making him eligible for graduation around age twenty. Several counselors have remarked about the discouraging realization that this forces on such youth.

Where both parents were present in the family, there is a lower tendency to drop out, probably indicative of the influence of a more stable family life. This interpretation is confirmed by other data which indicate a tendency for dropping out to increase when the head of the household is unemployed. Likewise there is an association between probability of dropping out and whether the youth contributed to the support of the family and

whether the family was receiving public assistance. Family and economic pathologies, as has been argued by many analysts of the dropout problem, appear to be linked with the propensity to drop out.

In summary, dropouts tended to be among the younger and older categories of enrollees, whites or Spanish surnames, and males who came from unemployed female headed households who were receiving public assistance. These trends are in basic conformity with the findings in the VEPS-T program.

PART V

VEPS CITY SUMMARIES

Eleven cities that initiated VEPS programs were studied intensively. This section of the report contains a comprehensive case study of each of these eleven cities; the data include all the information made available to the monitoring teams that are of consequence in reconstructing the progress of VEPS, describing various experiences, and assessing programmatic impact.

Each city is discussed separately. Each case study contains information on administrative structure and staff, enrollee selection, job development, pre-job orientation, on-going counseling, career exploration, and indicators of programmatic impact. The last of these, programmatic impact, considers primarily frequency distributions for certain types of programmatic outcomes: final disposition, reasons for terminations and dropouts, changes in grades and attendance patterns and certain demographic information. No attempt has been made to assess intangible programmatic impact in the city summaries. None of the case studies includes correlational analysis since the N in each of the cities was too small. Such discussion can be found in Part IV of this report.

We have attempted to avoid empirical or impressionistic evaluation in these summaries. It will be noticed even by the casual reader that wide differences occurred among programs, and programmatic impact had uneven results. The reader is cautioned not to impute to these data more than they justly deserve. More complete analysis and interpretation are reserved to Part IV and the reader should defer such judgment until the analytic portion of this report is read.

CLEVELAND, OHIO

VEPS-II was Cleveland's first experience with the program. The city of Cleveland is the prime sponsor for NYC, and prior to the Summer, 1972, the city had regularly subcontracted with the school system to administer the program. With the change in city administration, political and administrative uncertainty hampered immediate implementation of the VEPS program; this continued into the in-school phase. The city was unsure whether it would continue to subcontract to the Board of Education or whether the city, itself, would undertake the administration of the program. Although the school system did ultimately operate both NYC and VEPS for 1972-73, this proved to be a temporary arrangement which impeded stabilization of the program and long range development. The regular NYC program in Cleveland is substantial: 10,205 summer and 866 in-school slots.

Administrative Structure and Staff

Prior experience with the NYC program together with the advantages of a school system sponsored work experience program proved valuable assets in the implementation of VEPS in Cleveland. Administrative routines, forms, accounting systems, and similar functional necessities already in operation were adapted to accommodate the VEPS program. The VEPS program was integrated with relative ease into the regular NYC and work experience program.

The VEPS program in Cleveland was aided by a state of Ohio Office of Work Experience vocational education grant. These funds permitted the hiring of full-time staff to work one-half time on VEPS and one-half time in related work experience. The end result was an externally funded, nearly full-time VEPS staff. Funds were received sufficient to man five teacher-coordinator positions; in addition, a full-time VEPS coordinator was provided by the school system under the supervision of the NYC director. Staff were chosen by the NYC director and the principals of the participating high schools. During the summer, additional part-time staff were used in the organizational and job development effort.

During the summer, staff were utilized in planning the program, beginning the selection of students, and structuring a job development effort. Full scale implementation was scheduled for the beginning of school. Although summer staffing was completed by mid-July, some turnover in coordinators did occur. This did not appear to have an adverse affect on program operations. Full-time staff for the in-school phase were chosen by mid-August, and these personnel operated the program to its termination. Since the VEPS staff were designated as teacher-coordinators, counselor certification was not required. VEPS staff were provided in-service training for graduate credit through Cleveland State University. Ample opportunity for staff interchange was provided through the activities of the VEPS coordinator; communi-

cation among the staff appeared excellent. Although some difficulty was experienced in communicating the purpose and mechanics of the VEPS program to high school principals, no serious problems were encountered. Initially, school counselors cooperated well with the program, although as the job development effort intensified, some work experience counselors sensed competition from VEPS. Five high schools, all located in the inner city, were involved in the program. Arrangements were made for early release for VEPS enrollees, and graduation credit was provided for participation in the program.

Administrative routines were centralized through the VEPS coordinator who worked closely with the NYC director. The VEPS coordinator provided supervision of VEPS staff and general coordination of the project. Central records, including wage and hour data, were maintained at the NYC office. Due to the fact that Ohio public corporations do not pay FICA taxes, employers paid all enrollee fringe benefits. Time sheets were maintained by the employer; companies billed NYC for 50% of the wages upon certification by VEPS staff.

Overall, standard school-NYC procedures and organizational patterns were followed in implementing the VEPS program. State funding of counselors provided the means for staffing the program; central coordination was quite adequate. Ample opportunity was given the teacher-coordinators to adopt the program to individual needs of the enrollees. Communication among the VEPS staff and the central NYC administration was excellent. Record keeping and appropriate anecdotal counselor reports were also quite good. Overall guidance and administration of the program greatly facilitated the implementation of a quality program in Cleveland.

Enrollee Selection

The VEPS program was targeted for 100 youth with an additional 25 chosen as backups to participate in the career exploration and counseling program. State funding of the work experience units called for five groups of 20 to 25 youth each. Although the program processed 99 enrollees, substantially more were selected to participate. Some of these refused to participate, while others, identified as likely prospects, did not return to school in the fall. All youth were NYC eligible. The primary criterion for selecting enrollees was the potential benefit to the youth. Youth were selected in the summer and early fall by the VEPS teacher-coordinators in cooperation with the high school counselors and principals. Youth were assigned to VEPS without prior consultation with the prospective enrollee. Once chosen, contact with parents was initiated by letter informing them of the nature and intent of the program.

Ninety-nine youth moved through the program, and 78 (78.8%) completed the VEPS experience. The overall characteristics of the group indicate the youth were generally drop-out prone. Mean grade point average for the beginning group was 1.62 based on a 4.0 scale; mean days absent totaled 27. Two thirds of the enrollees were male. While 10.1% were under age 16 at the time of enrollment, all enrollees met the age requirement at the time of employment; 39.4% were age 16 and another 31.3% were age 17. Slightly more than three-quarters (75.8%) were black, and 9.1% had Spanish surnames. A plurality (41.4%) had completed their junior year, 29.3% their sophomore and 23.2% their freshman. Emphasis was placed on selecting seniors

for the program who would be entering the labor force upon graduation. It should also be noted that due to a policy of social promotions, a youth might be classified as a senior but be far short of the needed credits for graduation.

Job Development

The job development effort began in early July and continued into early November; most work sites were developed by late September. Initially two staff persons organized the job development effort during the early summer. When the state funded teacher-coordinators began to operate in August, responsibility for job development was turned over to them.

Regular school counselors assisted, at least in the early stages, in developing work sites. For some of these work experience counselors, VEPS came to have the appearance of a competitive program, which affected the degree of cooperation received. This did not, however, constitute a serious problem. The local National Alliance of Businessmen office was contacted for assistance, but other than placing an item in one of their newsletters, no assistance was received.

VEPS staff utilized a variety of approaches in developing jobs. First in priority for contact were the many small businesses within a short distance of the schools themselves. Other contacts were made with those companies which were advertisers in the school newspaper and the school yearbook. The assistance of community newspapers was also obtained. All the counselors were to some extent, involved in the routine drudgery of door-to-door contact in the job development effort. As the program developed, work sites were obtained on the outskirts of the central city, but transportation problems and costs precluded use of most of them. Many black businesses were found to be hesitant to employ allegedly "problem" youth (or any youth) due to claimed small profit margins. Staff also observed that the basic problem in job development faced by a counselor is the inverse relationship between degree of supervision and possibility of advancement when dealing with small and large employers. With the small employer, close supervision is more common, but the chances of advancement are somewhat restricted; the reverse is true with larger employers.

Formal agreements were utilized by the Cleveland program when signing up an employer. Staff noted some hesitancy on the part of the employers when the question of the formal agreement was brought up, but staff maintain that no appreciable number of employers were lost due to this. Youth were held in regular NYC jobs or were placed in a fast food processing outlet until suitable jobs could be found. Some effort was given to placing enrollees on jobs for which they had expressed an interest. As was the case in other VEPS cities, some employers were willing to assume total enrollee wage and fringe costs.

The work sites developed for VEPS were of generally good quality. Over two-thirds (68.0%) were with employers having fewer than thirty full-time employees; 26.0% were in the very smallest firms, those with less than five employees. Only 19.8% were employers of the large size (over 100 full-

time employees). A plurality (30.3%) of the jobs were in the service worker category; 22.2% were in clerical and kindred worker positions while 15.2% were classified in laborer occupations. Sales positions constituted 14.1% of the placements, operatives 12.1% and craftsmen 3.0%. A plurality of youth (49.0%) remained at a single employer throughout the VEPS experience, and 42.7% were employed at two sites. The remainder were employed at three or more worksites over the course of the program.

As with other VEPS programs, the individual types of positions held by the VEPS enrollees included unusual experiences as well as the more normal clerical, sales, cashier, and stock positions. Among the uncommon work experiences were floral arranging, landscaping, theatre production, bookbinding, photography aide, bakery aide, and butcher trainee. One enrollee began as an assistant to a food service manager and by the time of program completion, he had become the food service manager in a large retail outlet. Another enrollee was placed as a funeral home assistant, became interested in the occupation, and is planning to attend mortician school supported by his employer.

Pre-Job Orientation

Although some youth were working prior to the beginning of school, most enrollees were not placed until after the commencement of the state funded work experience courses. These classes met daily for a total of ninety minutes, which maximized enrollee-counselor contact possibilities. Pre-job orientation was conducted in these classes for most of the youth; those placed prior to the beginning of school were provided the basic NYC orientation package supplemented by counseling provided by the VEPS staff, usually on an ad hoc basis. The usual topics of grooming, attitudes, work habits, and employer-employee relations were covered in the orientation sessions.

Individual counseling was provided in certain cases, although this varied considerably among the teacher-coordinators. Generally, pre-job orientation was provided as an integral part of the structured vocational education curriculum mandated by the state grant.

On-Going Counseling

On-going counseling was greatly facilitated by the daily class sessions conducted by the VEPS counselors for the enrollees. This daily contact was supplemented through contact in school but outside the classroom, at the worksite, and in some instances at home. Contact between counselors and employers was on a regular bi-weekly basis; additional meetings where necessary were held to handle individual problems on a crisis intervention basis. Home contacts were not a matter of routine, but reflected individual problems. Group counseling and group sessions were frequently employed in the daily sessions. Counselors enforced a no school, no work rule.

Vocational Exploration

Vocational exploration was conducted by means of the daily class sessions. Several techniques were employed including group discussions, occupational research tasks, resource people, film strips, and field trips.

Instruction in the range of occupational possibilities was provided with opportunity for the individual enrollee to follow-up on a particular occupational interest. Some individual guidance was provided, but the bulk of the career exploration was provided through group sessions.

Good rapport between the enrollees and the teacher-coordinators greatly facilitated the orientation, counseling and career exploration components. The usual interest inventories, skill specifications, educational requirements and so forth were included in the exploration package.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Ninety-nine youth participated in the Cleveland VEPS program, although a slightly larger number were touched in some way. Of these, 78 or 78.8% completed the VEPS experience. The group of enrollees possessed those characteristics of the NYC stereotype. Only two were married; no data could be collected on dependent children. In 60.2% of the cases, enrollees came from female headed households; both parents were home in 24.2% of the cases. Not inconsistent with the above data, the head of household was unemployed in 62.8% of the cases, and 15.1% were underemployed (less than 35 hours per week). A sizable majority (71.9%) of the enrollees contributed to the support of the family. In most cases, (77.2%) the enrollees' families received some sort of welfare assistance, and 21.3% lived in public housing. Enrollees also had extensive prior work experience (97.8%), and 93.1% had held a job for thirty days or more. The overwhelming majority of these work experiences were in the regular NYC program.

Twenty-one youth did not complete the program, or 21.2% of the original group of enrollees. Fourteen (66.7%) of the terminators dropped out of school for any one of a variety of reasons. Five simply did not appear at the beginning of school, one other ran away from home, two obtained full-time jobs, two joined the military, and three dropped for reason of pregnancy. No reason was available for one youth. Of the remaining seven, two dropped because of conflict with other school activities, two were not interested, one quit his job, one was pregnant but remained in school and one was incarcerated. The number of dropouts was unexpectedly high given prior experience in the VEPS program; however, five of these dropouts stopped coming to school before they were deeply involved in the program. This was due to the enrollee selection procedures that were used. Eliminating these five from consideration reduced the dropout rate to 9.6%, roughly the equivalent dropout rate with other programs.

Youth who completed the program were most prone to remain employed at their VEPS worksite; fifty-four youth (54.5% of the total and 69.2% of the completers) fell into this category. In addition two other youth found other private sector employment. Eight continued their education, either in summer school to graduate or went on to higher education. Three joined the military. Ten were not working at the time of the survey and one had gone back to a regular NYC job. Thus, in an overall assessment, 85.9% of the completers achieved "favorable" outcomes, or 67.7% of the original group of enrollees. Graduating seniors also did well. While only two of the terminators graduated, thirty-three of the completers received diplomas,

one-third of the original group. Of these, twenty-one (63.6%) remained at the VEPS employer, one found other private sector work, three joined the military, and two went on to higher education. Six of the thirty-three graduates who completed the program were not working at the time of the survey.

In terms of impact upon academic performance, the results in Cleveland were mixed. Among completers, grade point average rose +0.62 from 1.68 to 2.30. Slightly over three-quarters (75.6%) improved their grade point, 7.7% remained constant, and only 16.7% declined. These obviously positive results are balanced by the fact that mean attendance declined by one full day from an average of twenty-three absences in 1971-72 to twenty-four in the VEPS year. About equal numbers of youth improved or declined in attendance. The experience in Cleveland adds strength to the thesis that grade point averages and attendance are not necessarily related phenomena.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

Colorado Springs began operation of the VEPS-II program in June, 1972. The NYC program is sponsored by the OEO-CAP agency. Although the regular NYC program operates beyond the City of Colorado Springs, VEPS was generally limited to Colorado Springs.

Administrative Structure and Staff

Colorado Springs selected a VEPS coordinator who was responsible for all phases of the VEPS program. The coordinator reported to the NYC director. The total 1972-73 summer NYC enrollment was 530 with the in-school program of fifty. VEPS was targeted to have thirty enrollees in addition to the regular NYC slots.

The VEPS coordinator was located in the NYC office. The operational plan called for the coordinator to select enrollees, conduct pre-job orientation, develop work sites, and provide on-going counseling and vocational exploration. This integrated, generalist staff model was consistent with the implementation recommendations, given the number of enrollees.

In addition, the later phases of the program were hampered by staff turnover in the job coordinator position. The third VEPS coordinator supervised the end of the program year. This turnover resulted in reduced program continuity which adversely affected all program components, especially on-going counseling of enrollees.

Individual enrollee record files were maintained at the NYC offices. Record forms included the NYC application, bi-weekly time sheets, enrollee progress reports and work site termination forms (where applicable).

The NYC program handled the payroll for the VEPS enrollees and paid the entire cost of fringe benefits. Employers reimbursed NYC for their share of enrollee wages. Colorado Springs encountered some billing problems with several smaller employers, but these were exceptional cases. In general the reimbursement procedure worked well.

Enrollee Selection

The VEPS coordinator contacted the head counselor in each of six high schools in order to obtain names of potential VEPS enrollees. The coordinator also talked with the outreach counselor in each of the schools. Through these discussions, the coordinator compiled a list of one hundred possible enrollees. No specific ranking was made of the types of problems which would qualify the potential enrollees as probable dropouts.

The students on the list were contacted and invited to join the VEPS program. Youth who accepted were scheduled for orientation sessions. The coordinator encountered a number of youth who already were enrolled in the summer NYC program or had other summer employment. Transfers from summer NYC slots were not easily arranged, and students who were working were reluctant to leave other summer jobs. Since specific jobs had not

been developed for VEPS enrollees, the coordinator could not assure the youth that they would be able to obtain employment with the program. Therefore, few youth in NYC or with other jobs joined the program. This had the effect of providing youth who had experienced a great deal of difficulty finding employment on their own with an additional work opportunity.

The coordinator initially used, as the pool of enrollees, those youth who attended the orientation sessions. Due to a lag in developing work sites some of the youth did not continue with VEPS after the brief orientation. Thus, the final group of VEPS enrollees in Colorado Springs were those youth who qualified for NYC and were placed at private sector work stations whether they had received orientation or not.

Forty-one youth were enrolled in VEPS-II in Colorado Springs. Slightly more than two-fifths (43.9%) were male. Over eighty percent were either 16 years old (45.0%) or 17 (37.5%). Five percent were 18 and 12.5% were 15 or younger at the time of enrollment. Enrollees with Spanish surnames accounted for 45.0% (18), 40.0% were white and 15.0% were black. Almost three-fifths (59.0%) of the enrollees were entering their senior year in school, while one-third were going into their junior year. Three enrollees were entering their sophomore or freshman year.

Job Development

The VEPS coordinator made personal calls to area businesses in order to develop training sites. Some assistance was received from a local personnel officers group, but the NAB was not involved in youth employment. There was some evidence that the work experience personnel at some high schools viewed the program as unnecessary competition for their regular work-study operations.

The coordinator made the majority of his contacts with smaller employers. Referrals to available training slots were made from the pool of youth who had been contacted about VEPS. A letter of agreement concerning enrollee participation and employer responsibilities and a training facility profile were obtained from all participating employers.

VEPS training sites were developed for forty-one enrollees. Over three-fifths (61.0%) of the enrollees were placed with employers having fewer than ten full-time employees. Slightly less than one-third (29.3%) were placed with companies having 10-19 workers, while 4.9% were in employee size classes 20-29 and 100 or more. Enrollees' VEPS work experiences were as follows: 41.5% as clerical and kindred workers; 22.0% laborers; 17.1% service workers; 7.3% each in sales workers and operatives and 4.9% as craftsmen. Almost four-fifths (58.5%) of the enrollees remained at one employer throughout the VEPS program year while 36.6% had two work experiences and 4.9% had three.

Pre-Job Orientation :

Pre-job orientation was conducted by the VEPS coordinator during the second week in June. Thirty youth who had been contacted took part in the sessions. The program was five hours each day for five days.

The sessions focused on discussions of the necessary attitudes and characteristics for succeeding in the world-of-work. Material contained in the VEPS Model was used in several of the presentations. In addition, representatives from groups such as CAMPS and the Youth Service Bureau were featured as guest speakers.

On-Going Counseling

The VEPS coordinator provided the on-going counseling for the enrollees. This was generally done at the VEPS work station. Contact with each enrollee was made approximately every two weeks.

This program component was hampered due to staff turnover during the VEPS program. Colorado Springs had a total of three VEPS coordinators during the year of program operation. Naturally, each coordinator required a certain amount of time to become familiar with the program, enrollees, and the training positions. While this created some difficulty, the NYC director provided continuity during each transitional period.

The enrollees which the CUP monitoring team observed on job site visits appeared to adapt reasonably well to the changes in the program administrators. However, some enrollees may have been terminated by employers during the changeovers due to the absence of a coordinator to mediate any work site or academic problems. In addition, new coordinators were forced to make some adjustments as enrollee eligibility had changed in some situations during the program year.

Vocational Exploration

The original VEPS coordinator had planned to rely heavily on the school system and the community college for assistance in implementing the vocational exploration component of VEPS. For example, it was planned that each student would meet individually with the chief job placement counselor at the community college at least once during the school year.

As a result of the turnover in the VEPS coordinator position, this plan was never fully implemented. Since each coordinator had to start at the beginning in terms of learning about the program, enrollees and work stations as well as begin dealing with everyday matters such as time sheets, payrolls, counseling contacts, and crisis situations, a vocational exploration program of the type envisioned in the guidelines was not implemented. However, both the second and third VEPS coordinator did attempt to touch on careers and future training in their counseling contacts.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Forty-one youth participated in the Colorado Springs VEPS program. Data on several items usually recorded on NYC applications were not available because the standard NYC were not utilized in Colorado Springs. Available information did indicate that thirty (88.2%) of the enrollees were in families which received some form of welfare assistance.

Fourteen enrollees (34.1%) completed the VEPS program in Colorado Springs, including six youth who graduated from high school; of those that terminated the VEPS program only two (4.9%) dropped out of school. Thir-

teen (31.7%) left the VEPS program but graduated from high school and twelve (29.3%) left VEPS but remained in school.

Of the fourteen completers, nine (64.3%) remained at their VEPS employer while one completer found other private sector employment. Only one enrollee was not working after the program year. Four of six completers who graduated retained their VEPS employment, while one found another private sector job; one was not working. The disposition of three completers is not known.

The reasons for terminating the program included: fired or quit totaling eight enrollees; found another job, four enrollees; and ineligible for NYC, lack of interest and school dropout, two enrollees each. Other reasons accounted for no more than one termination each. One of the enrollees who dropped out of school did so to get married and the other had no identifiable reason.

The VEPS enrollees in Colorado Springs followed the pattern of other youth in VEPS. Academic averages improved more frequently than did school attendance. Slightly under three-quarters (71.4%) improved their grade point, while 28.6% declined. Approximately one-fifth (21.4%) of the completers improved +.26 to +.75 of a point and an additional 50.0% improved by less than one-quarter of a grade point. Only one of the declines was more than three-quarters of a point. In attendance, 28.6% improved; 21.4% remained constant and 50.0% declined. Two enrollees had declined in attendance of ten days or more. Three enrollees improved by 4 to 9 days.

EUGENE, OREGON

The NYC sponsor in Eugene is the school system. The program covers a seven county area surrounding Eugene. NYC coordinators are located in Eugene, Roseburg, Albany, and North Bend. The area is composed primarily of small towns and rural areas. The Eugene NYC program had no prior experience with VEPS.

Administrative Structure and Staff

The school system had sponsored the NYC program for a number of years, and NYC had developed procedures for conducting their programs over the wide geographical area. The main administrative feature was the location of NYC coordinators responsible for all phases of both the in-school and out-of-school programs in Eugene and three outlying communities: Roseburg, Albany and North Bend. An additional coordinator was located at Newport during the summer program.

The NYC coordinators reported to the NYC director located in Eugene. A central file of enrollee records was maintained at the Eugene NYC office. All payrolls were handled by the school district facilities in Eugene. These procedures were used with the 1,300 summer NYC enrollees and the 225 in-school slots, eighty of which were in Eugene. VEPS was targeted to have a total of 40-60 enrollees in all locations.

VEPS-II was planned for implementation in those communities where NYC coordinators were located. Each of the coordinators was given responsibility for selecting enrollees. In addition to a roster of in-school and out-of-school NYC enrollees, each coordinator was permitted to add some youth who were not in the regular NYC program. Although dispersion of the VEPS program throughout the area required more effort than if it had been confined to Eugene, it was felt that the smaller towns and rural areas could benefit most from making placements at work sites in the private sector. Public sector openings are often severely limited or simply unavailable in these smaller areas.

The details of administration were worked out between the school district accounting department and the NYC program so that VEPS could begin with the in-school NYC program in September. The only detail that created problems was the method of integrating the VEPS cost sharing feature into the school district accounting system. The final arrangement was that NYC paid the enrollees the full amount of wages due and billed the companies monthly for their share of the cost. Due to the distances involved, the bi-weekly time sheets and checks were mailed to Eugene.

The use of existing coordinators in the VEPS program eliminated the need for training VEPS personnel in the use of NYC forms or procedures. Contact between the coordinators and the NYC director was maintained by telephone and regular meetings in Eugene; this had been standard NYC administrative practice.

Enrollee Selection

The VEPS program in the Eugene area planned on enrolling between 40 and 60 youth. However, youth were to be phased in gradually as the job development effort and the coordinator's other NYC program responsibilities proceeded. Since each of the coordinators would be working with only five to ten VEPS enrollees, pre-job orientation was to be conducted individually by the coordinator as youth were recruited for the program. Group sessions were not part of the program.

Most enrollees selected for VEPS in the Eugene program were taken from the NYC roster. Selection was based on the coordinator's first-hand knowledge of the youth's academic and family circumstances. Students were selected on the basis of the greatest potential benefit in terms of staying in school and preparing for a job. Students were enrolled from four of five high schools in Eugene and in each of the high schools serving the other communities.

Although selected from the NYC rolls and referred to a private sector work site, youth became VEPS enrollees only if hired by the employer. If the youth was not hired, he continued as an NYC enrollee and was referred to other work sites as these developed.

Forty-two youth were enrolled in the Eugene program. Due to Oregon state law, grade point averages and attendance data were not available on the enrollees. Two-thirds of the enrollees were male. A large percentage (35.7%) were under age sixteen (computed as of July 1, 1972), while 40.5% were seventeen and the remaining 23.8% were sixteen. Almost all (97.6%) the enrollees were white; 2.4% had Spanish surnames. A majority (54.8%) of VEPS students were going into their senior year while 23.8% had completed their freshman year and 21.4% their sophomore. Therefore, over half the enrollees in the Eugene program would be entering the labor force at the end of VEPS-II program year.

Job Development

Job development was conducted by the NYC-VEPS coordinator in each community. Two primary methods were used. First, coordinators sought out firms with positions in which enrollees had expressed an interest. This "custom" job development approach was especially suitable because each coordinator needed to obtain between five and ten positions in his community. Second, coordinators used their personal contacts with potential employers. Personal contacts would be expected to have considerable success in smaller towns, such as those represented in the Eugene program. This was generally true, although the number of youth placed was small.

Other techniques and arrangements were also used. In some cases the counselor in the high school provided work site leads to the coordinator. In other places the high school work experience personnel viewed the VEPS program as unnecessary competition for their programs. The coordinator in Eugene served as the NAB's youth coordinator which in turn provided some private sector employment potential for VEPS enrollees.

In all areas a formal employer agreement was used. NYC billed the participating companies monthly for their share of the enrollee wages.

Over the program year this procedure did not present any difficulties. Several employers were late with payments, but the system worked well with only minor processing problems.

VEPS work sites were developed for thirty-nine enrollees. Emphasis on developing training positions with smaller employers as well as an absence of many large employers resulted in almost ninety percent (89.7%) of the enrollees being placed with employers having fewer than twenty full-time employers; 71.8% were in firms employing fewer than ten. The remaining 10.3% were placed with firms employing 30-49 workers. The job classifications for the enrollees were consistent with other experiences: 23.8% in the operatives category; 21.4% service workers; 21.4% laborers; 11.9% clerical and kindred workers; 7.1% craftsmen; and 7.1% sales workers. Over four-fifths of the enrollees (82.1%) remained with one employer during the program year. Enrollees had two work experiences in 17.9% of the cases.

Pre-Job Orientation

The planning for pre-job orientation was essentially dictated by the small number of VEPS enrollees assigned to each coordinator and the travel distances involved for the enrollees and the coordinators. Each coordinator conducted individual sessions with VEPS enrollees as they transferred from NYC to VEPS.

The length of the sessions varied according to the amount of orientation the enrollee had received when he entered NYC and the coordinator's judgment on which topics needed further work. The coordinators conducted the sessions at the NYC offices, sometimes holding several meetings with each enrollee. Sessions totaled from approximately three to ten hours per enrollee. The content generally focused on the VEPS program, the training position and the labor market conditions in the community.

On-Going Counseling

On-going counseling for VEPS enrollees was included as an addition to the coordinator's regular counseling load of in-school and out-of-school NYC enrollees. In most cases this involved regular meetings between the enrollee and the coordinator, supplemented with other contacts as needed.

Counseling contacts were usually made at the work site, but were also made at school and the enrollee's home. Coordinators used several forms to report on enrollee progress at the work station. Coordinators experienced no difficulty in contacting enrollees at the job site. Since most employers were small, the impact of such visits on the regular work force was not great. Schedules varied in the four communities: one coordinator visited the site weekly while another used a bi-weekly schedule. In all cases observed during site visits, the coordinators appeared well informed on the individual enrollee's progress, both at the training station and in school.

Vocational Exploration

Vocational exploration was implemented in several ways. Originally, Eugene had planned to make extensive use of the Occupational Information Access System (OIAS) which was developed by the University of Oregon. OIAS contains a data file on 206 occupations, geared primarily to the

Oregon employment market. Students communicate with the system through on-line remote computer terminals and after answering a set of questions, receive a computer print-out of occupations that their answers indicate an aptitude or interest in. However, problems of timing and distance, especially for the outlying programs, precluded the system's use in VEPS.

Coordinators in the Eugene program operationalized vocational exploration using three methods. First, in several cities, the VEPS enrollees were placed in the high school's regular work experience classes. This enabled the enrollees to obtain high school credit for the VEPS work experience. Only one high school in the seven county area would not permit this.

A second additional arrangement was made by one coordinator in a smaller community. He enlisted the assistance of the high school counselor and the vocational rehabilitation counselor in the area. They met one hour per week with the VEPS enrollees.

The third approach, adopted at several locations, was group meetings. Enrollees were exposed to topics such as completing sample application forms, information on filing tax returns, and role playing for interviews. They also had an opportunity to compare job assignments and discuss career goals.

The Eugene area appears to have been successful in adapting the vocational exploration concept to their geographically dispersed area. The coordinators' initiative and experience in working independently appears to be the primary reason.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Indicators of programmatic impact in Eugene must rest with the completion and graduation data. State law precluded the obtaining of any academic records from the school systems. Another complicating factor was that, since the standard NYC application form was not required, information was not compiled for all youth in the program.

A total of forty-two youth were enrolled in VEPS. Available information indicates that over fifty percent were living in female headed households. Two-fifths of the heads of household were unemployed and a like number were employed more than 35 hours per week with the remainder working less than 35 hours per week. Approximately eight percent of the families had incomes under \$5,000 per year. More than half the youth contributed to the support of their families. However, only 11.1% of the youth lived in families which were receiving any form of welfare assistance.

Slightly over half of the enrollees had worked previous on a job lasting more than thirty days. These jobs were primarily in the NYC program.

Of the forty-two enrollees, twenty (47.6%) completed the program. Nine of the completers also graduated from high school. The disposition of VEPS enrollees was: eight (19.1%) remained at their VEPS employer; two (4.8%) found other private sector employment; five (11.9%) returned to the NYC program; two (4.8%) had other outcomes; three (7.1%) were not working; and twenty-two (52.4%) terminated VEPS. Therefore, one-half of the completers were employed in either the private or public sector after the

VEPS program year.

The main reason for leaving the program was dropping out of school; of the twenty-two terminations, eight dropped out of school. Although this percentage is somewhat higher than other VEPS cities, the outcomes were not as bad as the dropout percentage might indicate. Of the eight high school dropouts, two entered military service, one accepted full-time employment, two were married and one dropped out for an unknown reason. Other reasons for termination include finding another job (four enrollees); quit or fired (four); moving out of the community (two); lack of interest, marriage, transfer to NYC and conflict with other school activities (one each).

FLINT, MICHIGAN

The Flint Board of Education is the NYC sponsor. NYC conducted both a VEPS-I and a VEPS-II program. Prior experience with the implementation of the VEPS concept was an obvious advantage for the second year program. In addition a number of other work experience programs are conducted through the same centralized office responsible for the NYC program. School facilities, staff, counseling hardware and software were made available to the program; support resources were generally excellent. Reference may be made to the summary report of the VEPS-I program for additional information on the Flint approach to VEPS and for comparative purposes.

Administrative Structure and Staff

Board of Education sponsorship of the NYC program simplified the administrative and coordinative processes required for the VEPS program. Academic and work records, hour and wage verifications, payrolls, and anecdotal counseling reports were centralized in the NYC office. NYC paid all enrollee wages and was reimbursed by private sector employers through a billing procedure. VEPS counselors picked up the enrollee time sheets and delivered all paychecks.

Despite the fact that Flint had operated a VEPS-I program, no summer VEPS-II program was initiated. The reasons for this were several. Due to problems encountered in the late stages of VEPS-I, no follow through procedures were instituted. The entire VEPS-I staff was replaced in late May of 1972, which inhibited continuity. Funding for the VEPS-II staff was also not available directly from NYC. Since unencumbered funds remained from the U.S. Office of Education grant for the VEPS-I program, authority was obtained to utilize these funds for the in-school phase of VEPS-II. These funds were sufficient to provide for two full-time VEPS counselors and a VEPS coordinator.

Due to these funding and staff continuity problems, Flint did not conduct a summer component. Beginning in late August and running through mid-September, preparatory arrangements for an in-school component were conducted by the regular NYC staff, primarily through the efforts of a school principal. However, the counseling staff did not begin until late September; both counselors were qualified for the counseling position.

VEPS enrollees were selected from four high schools and were about evenly divided by sex. The male counselor handled all the male enrollees, and the female counselor all the female. Overall coordination was provided by the VEPS project director; both counselors were given ample freedom to develop their own counseling and career exploration packages. This decentralized counseling routine was the same basic design conducted in VEPS-I, although safeguards were instituted to prevent reoccurrence of the VEPS-I

problems. The VEPS-II administrative structure and staffing pattern were close to that of VEPS-I.

Enrollee Selection

Original program plans called for the recruitment of seventy youth for the VEPS program, evenly divided between males and females; 67 youth actually participated. All enrollees were NYC eligible, and most had previously participated or applied for the regular NYC program. Recruitment procedures paralleled those in the VEPS-I program. From the NYC eligible list, a preliminary sort was used to identify those youth who met the minimum age criterion. From these, an examination of high school records, conversations with counselors and principals, and discussions with the prospective enrollees and their parents expanded the basis for selection. This procedure was handled by a high school principal during the late summer months. The final selection process was completed by early October, shortly after the VEPS counselors had been brought into the program.

The recruitment process resulted in the selection of youth who would gain the most benefit, who were among the target group of the program, and who had been fully informed as to the nature and scope of the program's requirements. The mean grade point average of beginning enrollees was 1.64 and mean days absent totaled 28. These data are quite similar to that found among the VEPS-I enrollees. Some carryover from VEPS-I took place; 18 enrollees (26.9%) fell into this category. Enrollees were about equally divided among males and females; 34.3% were age 16 and 44.8% were age 17. The vast majority (83.6%) were black; another 6.0% had Spanish surnames. Except for a higher percentage of seventeen year olds in VEPS-II, the demographic characteristics of both groups of VEPS enrollees were quite similar.

Job Development

Some carryover among VEPS employers from the first year program aided the job development effort in Flint. Due to the substantial experience in job development for related non-NYC work experience programs, ample contacts already existed in the community. However, a depressed job market in the Flint area hindered the development sequence. No other assistance from outside agencies such as NAB was received or actively solicited. Actual job development was conducted primarily by the VEPS counselors, assisted by other NYC program personnel. Job stations were found for 61 of the 67 enrollees.

Flint VEPS utilized a work agreement form to ensure employer understanding of program requirements which had been one of the operational problems in the VEPS-I program. Some employers refused to sign a work agreement form for fear of a contractual arrangement. In some cases of this sort, work sites were used, although monitored somewhat more closely. The cost sharing of wages proved to be an attractive feature in job development, mainly due to the depressed job situation in the region.

Most of the job sites were with small employers; 95.0% of the work stations had fewer than thirty full-time employees, and 73.7% had between five and nineteen full-time employees. Although the attempt was made to

correspond enrollee interests with work sites, the tight job market prevented total implementation of this objective. As a result, 41.0% of the enrollees were placed in service worker positions, 23.0% in clerical and kindred experiences, 16.4% as laborers, and the remainder scattered among sales (8.2%), craftsmen (1.6%), and operatives (9.8%). As was the common VEPS experience, a majority (59.0%) remained at the same employer throughout the experience, while 31.1% were placed at two sites and 9.8% at three work stations.

The range and quality of occupational experiences was not as broad as that in the VEPS-I program, again due to the restricted availability of work sites. A preponderance of the stations were in service categories, although a good proportion were of such a nature that the enrollee was put in the position of dealing with the general public. Among the more unusual stations were several in wig styling and cosmetology, shipping and receiving clerk, and a travel agent.

Pre-Job Orientation

Based largely on the prior year's experience, the VEPS staff implemented a sixty-hour orientation package containing the usual world-of-work components. Despite the late start of the program, orientation was completed by mid-October. The orientation ran over a four to six week period, with an average of three hours a day. VEPS staff estimated that about one-fourth of the enrollees required additional orientation beyond the sixty hours.

Most of the orientation was held in group sessions, although individual guidance was provided where required. Most sessions were held in the school buildings. Over the course of the orientation, skill and interest inventories were taken. Written exercises were made an integral part of the orientation. All enrollees were processed through orientation before being placed on the job. Enrollees who had participated in the VEPS-I program were given brief refreshers and were occasionally utilized as resource persons in the orientation program. The overall thrust and content of the orientation were quite similar to VEPS-I.

On-Going Counseling

Flint again utilized a counseling work division based on the sex of the enrollee. Apparently, this approach had success in VEPS-I and the experience with VEPS-II showed nothing to contradict its general suitability. The on-going counseling component was probably the strongest aspect of the Flint program. Good rapport between VEPS counselors and the enrollees was a major factor in the success of the counseling program. Contacts with the youth were made at school, work, and home. School contact was a regular component due to the career exploration activities of the staff. Employer contact was maintained through the bi-weekly time sheet pickup task which provided the opportunity for discussions with employers to determine the degree of progress or existence of problems.

Since the counselors also delivered the paychecks to the youth at the job, this gave the counselor another opportunity to make contact with the youth. Home visitations were less frequent and usually resulted from crisis

situations. The apparent ingredients of success in the counseling component were the frequency of contact, the rapport established between counselor and youth, and most importantly the availability of the counselor. In several instances this availability could have degenerated into dependency, although the counselors handled those situations quite well.

Vocational Exploration

As with the other program components, the experience with the VEPS-I program facilitated vocational exploration. Exposure to career possibilities was undertaken through both group and individual sessions. The vocational exploration component was undertaken separately by the two counselors, but joint activities were implemented. General coordination of vocational exploration was undertaken by the VEPS coordinator.

Career options were identified in the orientation sessions, and subsequent exposures were based on those choices. When a youth no longer expressed an interest in the occupation, new choices were developed and explored. An attempt was made to bring the youth in contact with an individual employed in the occupation under consideration.

The broad range of occupations was also emphasized. In addition to the usual discussion sessions, use was made of resource persons from the community, vocational guidance instructional materials, and field trips. Among the last were visitations to Central Michigan University, Kellogg Company, AC Spark Plug, and the local Skill Center. Exposures were not limited to occupational categories but included cultural and social events as well.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Although seventy youth were targeted for the program, ten of those were earmarked as backups. The backups received all the counseling and orientation features, but were held in reserve pending the availability of work sites. Ultimately, 61 youth were placed on work sites. Of the 67 youth who started the program, only 29 (43.3%) completed VEPS.

All of the youth were single; no data was available to determine the number of youth having dependent children of their own, although counselors reported that such instances were rare. As is common in other VEPS programs, 72.7% came from female (mother) headed households; both parents were present in 19.7% of the cases. Unemployment was high among heads of households; 86.2% were unemployed and another 4.6% were underemployed. Similar to VEPS-I, none of the youth contributed to the support of the family, although such data are usually suspect. Nearly seventeen percent of the youth resided in public housing, and 83.1% received some sort of welfare assistance. A majority (53.9%) had held a job for which they received wages, and 44.8% had worked for thirty days or more. Most of this work experience had been in the regular NYC program.

As previously noted, 43.3% completed the program. Of the thirty-eight youth who terminated, six (15.8%) dropped out of school; however, this represents only 9.0% of the total group. Military service and full-time employment accounted for two of the dropouts. The remaining four could not be

located to determine the reason. Of the other thirty-two youth, eighteen were laid off, fired, quit, or did not show up for work. Three were not interested after they had been recruited, two each found other jobs or were pregnant, two more never were placed and quit VEPS, one was transferred to NYC, and one had a conflict with other school activities. Information is unavailable for the remainder.

Of the twenty-nine youth who did complete the program, nineteen (65.5%) remained at the VEPS employer, two went on to school, one joined the military, and one found other private sector work. Four (13.8%) were not working. Of the fourteen seniors who graduated and completed VEPS, six (42.9%) remained at their VEPS employer, two went on to higher education, one found other private sector work, and one joined the military. Four were not working at the time of data collection.

The VEPS program had a marginal, but positive impact on the academic performance of the enrollees. For all enrollees the mean grade point average was 1.62 with an average of twenty-eight days absent in 1971-72. Among completers mean grade point rose +0.18 from 1.73 to 1.91. On the other hand, mean days absent increased from an average among completers of 27 days absent in 1971-72 to 31 during the VEPS year. Grade point change bulked between those who improved +0.26 to +0.75 (21.4%), those who declined -0.26 to -0.75 (21.4%), and those who remained about the same (50.0%). However, only 34.5% of the youth improved their attendance while 65.5% deteriorated; 48.3% of the youth declined by four or more days. As was found in other cities, the relationship between grade point average and attendance is negligible.

FORT WORTH, TEXAS

The Fort Worth VEPS-II program was essentially a continuation of the VEPS-I program. The NYC-VEPS sponsor is the Fort Worth Independent School District. Prior VEPS experience was particularly helpful in the area of job development; many VEPS-I employers continued into the VEPS-II program year.

Administrative Structure and Staff

The NYC office is located in the school administration building, and VEPS was operated as an integral part of the vocational-industrial program of the city schools. Fort Worth conducted both a summer and an in-school program. HEW funds were available for a summer phase which ended August 26.

The NYC director had overall responsibility for VEPS. During the summer, he was assisted by three full-time counselors from the school system. With the reduction of VEPS funds, staff was reduced to two for the in-school program.

Academic records of enrollees were maintained by the six high schools served by the program. VEPS records were maintained by the NYC administrative office. Monthly progress reports from counselors, with emphasis upon problem cases, were an essential part of the supervisory process.

The NYC office handled general administrative detail including payroll processing and overall coordination. Counselors picked up time sheets at the job site. In some cases, NYC paid full wages and fringes and was reimbursed by the employer. In other cases, enrollees received two checks, one from the company, and the other from NYC. An attempt was made to be flexible in this regard in order to accommodate the employer. The program utilized an employer agreement form and experienced no great difficulty in collecting the employer's share of the wages in cases where this option was chosen.

The program, because of its sponsorship by the school system, experienced no problems in arranging academic credit for students participating in VEPS. Those participating for a full year received two credits towards graduation. The school system also allowed considerable flexibility in scheduling to facilitate the VEPS work schedule.

Selection of Youth

For the first year of the VEPS program, Fort Worth did not follow the enrollee selection guidelines closely. The VEPS staff maintained that

selection was based primarily on factors such as family, health and emotional problems which might lead to a dropout, rather than those having serious academic problems. In selecting VEPS-II enrollees, an attempt was made to follow the revised guidelines more closely. The selection process involved: (1) the determination that the youth met the NYC poverty guidelines, (2) recommendations by school personnel (counselors and teachers), and (3) a final sort by personal interview. For the in-school phase about five percent of the enrollees were selected from a modification school. Although it was conceded that some "creaming" had been done in selecting VEPS-II enrollees, Fort Worth did attempt to reach the probable dropout.

Sixty-three youth were enrolled for the program year. They entered with a mean grade point average of 2.24 and a mean absence level of 24 days. Almost three-quarters (73.0%) of the youth were seniors; 25.4% were juniors. Over half (55.9%) were seventeen years old, 10.5% were over seventeen, and 30.5% were sixteen. Males accounted for 53.4% of the enrollees; 77.8% were black and 14.3% had Spanish surnames.

Job Development

Since Fort Worth had an excellent retention rate among VEPS-I employers, little job development was required for VEPS-II. Almost 100% of the first year employers participated in the second year program. NAB was not involved in any way with VEPS-II.

Most job sites (67.2%) were with employers having fewer than twenty full-time employees, 39.3% had fewer than ten employees. At the other end of the scale, 11.5% of the job sites were with the largest companies (those having 100 or more employees). These stations reflected past contacts and working relationships established by one VEPS counselor in his previous capacity as an administrator in private industry.

A variety of work experiences were offered in Fort Worth. A quarter (25.4%) of the positions were clerical; 20.6% were craft; 19.0% were operative. Only 4.8% of the youth were in sales positions; 11.1% were laborers, and 12.7% had experience as a service worker. Four of five (80.3%) had only one work experience; only 1.6% had three or more different experiences.

Counselors felt that the wage sharing feature is a big factor in the VEPS acceptance by the Fort Worth business community. They see VEPS as something more than a "handout" program. In a conservative community, this is important.

Pre-Job Orientation

The summer VEPS enrollees were placed on the job without formal pre-job orientation. For the in-school phase there was no formal pre-job orientation, but there was an attempt by the counselors, on a one-to-one basis, to prepare the youth for the job interview. This component of the VEPS program was the most obvious deviation from program guidelines.

On-Going Counseling

In attempting to up-grade the VEPS in-school counseling, Fort Worth stressed direct counselor involvement with the enrollee on a one-to-one basis.

No group sessions were held. One counselor had a great deal of contact with his enrollees. He made home visits, weekly job-site contacts, and frequently telephoned parents. He felt that these were quite beneficial for the youth, parents and the program as a whole. The other counselor only dealt with problem situations.

Career Exploration

No career exploration other than that received as a part of the Fort Worth school's on-going career exploration classes was used. VEPS enrollees participated in these classes as part of their credit program for VEPS work experience.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

An overwhelming majority (96.8%) of Fort Worth enrollees were single. One-third (36.8%) lived with both parents, but over half (52.6%) lived in a female headed household. No data were available on employment for the head of the household, but 68.6% of the families received some welfare assistance and 17.6% lived in public housing. Just over half (52.4%) of the youth had work experience prior to VEPS, but in most cases this was NYC public sector work experience.

Of the sixty-three youth, twenty-two (34.9%) did not complete the program year. All, however, remained in school. Four were laid off or quit, the same number found other jobs and terminated because the program affected their academic performance. Three lost interest and two moved out of the community. Illness, marriage, or school activity each accounted for one termination. The reasons for termination in two cases could not be determined.

Forty-one (65.1%) of the enrollees completed the program. Most of these (46.3%) remained with their VEPS employer. Higher education claimed 17%; a like number returned to NYC. Four (9.7%) were unemployed; one joined the military and one got married.

Overall the mean grade point average of Fort Worth enrollees declined, going from 2.34 to 2.18 for the forty-eight cases where complete information was available. Among completers there was also a decline, but not as great as among all enrollees. For completers the mean declined from 2.49 to 2.34. Exactly half of the enrollees declined in grade point average, 20.8% remained constant and 29.2% improved. Seventeen of the twenty-four who declined went down by three-quarters of a grade point or more; eleven of these had completed the program. Ten of the fourteen who improved did so by three-quarters of a letter grade or more; seven of these completed the program.

While academic performance declined, school attendance improved in Fort Worth. This was true for all enrollees and for those who completed the program. For all enrollees there was a mean improvement of five days, for completers there was a mean improvement of seven days. Three-quarters (74.5%) of all enrollees improved; slightly fewer (72.1%) of the completers improved. However, among all those who did improve, there is more improvement among those who completed the program.

GEORGETOWN, TEXAS

The Georgetown CAP agency covers twenty-seven counties in an area close to the capitol city of Austin. The largest city within the CAP area is Temple (33,431). For the purpose of the VEPS program, this was considered a rural area with many problems unique to a rural program.

Administrative Structure and Staff

The NYC-VEPS sponsor in Georgetown is the Williamson-Burnet County Opportunities, Inc. Administration of the VEPS program was complicated by two factors: territorial spread and lack of cooperation by a number of school districts.

VEPS was administered through the NYC Director. Originally it was planned that the Assistant NYC Director would assume major responsibility for the VEPS program, but this never developed. Two full-time VEPS counselor-job-developers were hired. As the year progressed, these functions were divided; one staff member did the counseling, the other concentrated on job development.

Initially the NYC Director had a number of concerns. He felt he was not in a competitive position in regard to counselors' salaries but had managed to secure funds for one counselor. The NYC Director, through his political connections, did manage to secure additional funds above the original DOL allocation. Another concern was that transportation for enrollees had potential as a very serious impediment to the success of the program due to the rural spread of the program.

On the positive side, the NYC Director was enthusiastic over the prospect of placing enrollees in the private sector, as he was dissatisfied with the quality of some job slots in the public sector, especially the schools.

The regular NYC in-school program had four hundred slots. It was planned to earmark one hundred VEPS slots, starting with thirty in the area's population centers. After experimenting with the logistics of carrying out the program in a setting of extreme distances, it was hoped that they could move into the rural areas. This never happened: enrollment never exceeded twenty-five, and movement into the rural areas never occurred. All enrollee wages were paid by NYC, and the employers were billed for their share. No problems with collection from private employers took place.

One internal administrative problem did affect the VEPS program. VEPS was operated as a nearly autonomous program with the VEPS staff reporting directly to the NYC Director. The NYC Coordinator, who had the administrative responsibility for NYC, was bypassed. Since the VEPS enrollees came

from NYC and were working in NYC slots, this was upsetting to the regular NYC staff who saw VEPS as an infringement on their territory.

Enrollee Selection

The staff tried to follow the guidelines in the selection of enrollees. This was particularly true in the initial group of ten selected at the end of the summer. After that, VEPS had to accept transfers from NYC and had little control over the selection process. All enrollees, however, were NYC eligible. The criteria of probable dropout was often operationalized as possible dropout. As the program developed, the location of a job sometimes influenced the selection of the enrollee; this was necessary because of the extreme distances between job site and the enrollee.

Three out of four of the enrollees were male: 30.4% were seventeen, 26.1% were eighteen, only 4.3% were fifteen. Of the twenty-five youth, 60% were black and 12% had Spanish surnames. This was quite at variance with the NYC population which split 50% white and 25% each black and Spanish surnamed. As to grade in school, 16.7% were sophomores, 54.2% were juniors, and 25% were seniors. The mean grade point average for enrollees was 1.84 on a 4.0 scale with an average of 18 days absent during the previous academic year.

Job Development

Several factors hindered job development. Territorial spread made it impossible to develop jobs throughout the area simultaneously. It was decided to concentrate on one population center at a time. Initially, jobs were developed in Georgetown and Bartlett. This was done in early September. Late that month the VEPS job counselor concentrated on Lexington and Temple. Several school districts refused to participate in the VEPS program. San Marcos refused to cooperate, fearing that VEPS would compete with their Cooperative Education program. Georgetown and Temple initially refused to cooperate but the counselors convinced the appropriate school official that VEPS was no threat to other programs and thus secured their cooperation.

The NAB office in Austin was contacted and the reception, according to the counselors, was positive but there was no follow-through on the part of NAB. On a job site visit in Bartlett, the monitoring team met the Mayor who had been instrumental in obtaining four job sites. He was pleased with the program concept and felt that the business people had been enthusiastic also. He explained that "paving the way" was necessary because the community had been very resentful of the VISTA activity and did not want to get involved in any similar program.

Another factor which hindered job development was the substantial amount of under-employment in the area. This made many employers hesitant to hire enrollees at the minimum wage (although the program was paying half) when regular employees were making less than the minimum wage. Many employers felt that it was too much for a youth to earn.

Despite these problems, the jobs developed by the VEPS staff were generally good. The jobs included Day Care Centers, Nursing Homes, ranches,

cabinet making, and the usual sales and clerical positions. Most employers were quite small: 28% had fewer than five full-time employees, another 28% had between five and nine, only 16% had over fifty. Service and clerical positions accounted for most of the job stations: 28% of the youth had service jobs and 24% had clerical positions. Sales and craft positions each accounted for 12% of the youth. The rest were evenly divided among professional, operative and laborer positions. Only 12% of the youth received more than one work experience.

Pre-Job Orientation

The initial VEPS orientation totaled about four hours. It was held on two evenings from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. and consisted of films, talks on things that are important in seeking a job, questions and answers, and group discussion. Primary emphasis was placed on the world-of-work, job attitudes and the work environment. Additional counseling was provided on an individual basis. As additional youth were selected for the VEPS program, the pre-job counseling was handled almost exclusively on a one-to-one basis.

On-Going Counseling

Given the geographic spread, the two-hour weekly counseling sessions proved impossible to implement. For the most part, on-going counseling was handled on a one-to-one basis, usually at the job site. Home visits were rarely made. The VEPS counselor felt that each enrollee received approximately one-half hour a week in counseling. An exception was those enrollees from Georgetown. These enrollees had one hour of classroom study related to their field of interest or general work information such as grooming, how to start a bank account, etc.

Career Exploration

Vocational exploration consisted almost entirely in handing out literature, a few film strips, and occasional personal discussions. This component was quite weak. No field trips were planned nor were any guest speakers brought in. Again the exception was in Georgetown; the one hour a day in the classroom often focused on various aspects of career exploration.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

All but one of the enrollees was single, and 58.3% came from two-parent households. None lived in public housing (there is little in the area) and only one received any public assistance. A little more than one-third (36.8%) contributed to the support of the family. A plurality (45.9%) were in family situations where the head worked less than thirty-five hours a week; one-fourth (25.1%) came from situations where the head was unemployed. Four of five of the enrollees had previously worked but only 12.5% were working at the time of enrolling in VEPS. For most of the youth, previous employment had been with NYC.

Only seven of the twenty-five youth (28%) completed the VEPS program. Eight of the youth who terminated were laid off or quit, five had transpor-

tation problems, three dropped out of school, one found another job and one had a conflict with school activities. Of the seven youth who finished the program, four remained with their VEPS employer, two found other private sector work and one returned to NYC.

The academic indicators for Georgetown are positive, although the small number of cases makes it difficult to draw many conclusions. Three-quarters of the youth for which we had information improved their grade point average, the rest declined. Two-thirds of the completers improved G.P.A., but 80% of the terminators did so. In all cases, improvement was slight, 58.3% of the improvement was a quarter of a grade point or less; 25% was between a quarter and three-quarters of a point. The average improvement was 0.11 on a 4.0 scale. Attendance change was available for only nine cases; seven improved and two remained constant. Six of the seven who improved attendance had terminated the program; both of those who remained constant in their attendance completed the program. The average improvement in attendance was six days.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

Las Vegas was one of the second year VEPS cities and had no experience with the VEPS-I program. Clark County School District is the Neighborhood Youth Corps sponsor and is responsible for other work experience programs. While the district covers the entire county, the VEPS-II program was confined to the city of Las Vegas and no attempt was made to initiate the program in surrounding smaller communities.

- Administrative Structure and Staff

School system sponsorship of the NYC program, as in other cases, facilitated implementation of VEPS-II. Easy and extensive cooperation of the schools characterized program administration. In addition to the NYC director who devoted some time to supervision of the VEPS program, one other half-time coordinator was utilized. The latter's responsibilities included general supervision of the program, some counseling, coordination with the vocational counselors in each of the high schools, and liaison with the private sector representative. Since the number of youth involved in the program was small and job placement involved a relatively unique arrangement, overall administration and implementation were simplified.

Las Vegas represents a unique VEPS program in that all of the enrollees were placed with the same employer--the main and branch offices of the Bank of Nevada. The entire program was coordinated with the bank including the selection, orientation, counseling and work experiences of the youth. Due to a high turnover rate among its employees, the bank approached the school system with a proposal for a bank training course; this developed simultaneously with the VEPS-II program. Under terms of the agreement worked out between NYC and the bank, a highly structured but relatively simple program was organized. A Bank Advisory Board consisting of representatives of the various departments in which the enrollees would be working was established, and a bank official was designated as general coordinator for the bank. NYC also designated a half-time coordinator. Youth were selected for the program and an orientation program was conducted through joint efforts. Counseling routines were to be handled by the school personnel with the advice and assistance of bank officials and the advisory board; work supervision was the responsibility of the bank.

The bank kept all time records, issued all checks, and billed NYC once a month. In addition the bank provided salary increments on an incentive and performance basis. Academic and counseling records were maintained by NYC and the school system. A vocational counselor was stationed in each of the high schools to work with the VEPS enrollees as part of the normal NYC assignment; responsibilities included liaison with work and central NYC, school counseling, and remedial education where required. The NYC VEPS coordinator provided overall direction to the program, participated in the liaison with

the bank, and assisted in counseling of the youth. As executed, the program was well coordinated and administered.

Enrollee Selection

As part of the agreement with the bank, no more than fifteen youth were to be placed on work stations at any one time. Twenty-one youth were recruited, the extras serving as backups. All youth met the NYC eligible guidelines. The agreement between the bank and NYC called for the selection of sixteen year old, eleventh grade students who expressed an interest in banking as a career. NYC identified eligible youth and performed the preliminary screening; the advisory bank board conducted interviews and participated in the final selection.

The effect of the procedure was to select youth who would most benefit from the program, who had an interest in banking, and who showed a reasonable chance for success. Both the NYC staff and the bank personnel insisted that creaming was a necessity for this particular component. Of the twenty-one enrollees, nineteen (90.5%) were female; they were equally divided (42.9% each) among sixteen and seventeen year olds; one was eighteen and two were nineteen. Two-thirds were black; none had a Spanish surname. Twenty were seniors. The selectivity process is demonstrated by the fact that the mean grade point average for the beginning group of enrollees was 2.73 on a 4.0 scale; mean days absent totalled 18.

Job Development

All work stations were with the Bank of Nevada. Work assignments were spread throughout the various bank departments. The availability of these work stations was the major impetus to implementation of VEPS. Some consideration was given to expanding the program to include other employers having a large bloc of jobs. Efforts here did not progress beyond a preliminary investigation stage.

Pre-Job Orientation

Pre-job orientation involved close coordination between NYC and the bank. Following selection, youth were provided a basic world-of-work orientation, largely the regular NYC training. A specific course was developed for the youth geared to principles and procedures of banking. A teacher coordinated the course which involved substantial instruction by banking personnel and followed a course curriculum developed by the California Bankers Association.

Enrollees began the course on June 15 and were assigned work stations on June 20. The normal day consisted of two hours in the classroom and four hours on the job. During the in-school phase, enrollees worked up to four hours a day. The course lasted twelve weeks, and graduation credit was arranged for its completion. Because of the single employer, the orientation program was highly concentrated and extremely effective.

On-Going Counseling

Again due to the selective recruitment process, counseling problems

were minimal compared to other programs. School counselors, coordinated and assisted by the VEPS coordinator, handled most of the routine school and personal counseling; group sessions were held as a supplement to regular individual meetings. On the job, a bank official was assigned as a trouble shooter and handled most problems arising between the youth and his supervisor or fellow workers. VEPS staff were brought in as the occasion demanded. Most of the youth adjusted quite well, although home problems did affect the work performance of some. VEPS staff attributed this difficulty to the fact that the youth was receiving a regular paycheck in a welfare situation. These were largely problems which neither the bank nor NYC could effectively resolve. As the attempt was made to mitigate the more serious effects of the home situation, VEPS counselors came to the conclusion that a structured program for the parents was required which, in part, would inform them of the abilities and deficiencies of the youth. Home contacts were normally limited to crisis situations.

Vocational Exploration

Vocational exploration, except within the broad confines of the banking profession, was limited. Since all but one of the youth were seniors, the program did provide an immediate prospect for employment upon graduation.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Twenty-one youth were enrolled in the VEPS program in Las Vegas. All were single, and most (71.4%) came from a female-headed household. Nineteen percent had both parents present in the household. One-third of the heads of households were employed full-time, but 52.4% were unemployed. In almost two-thirds (63.2%) of the cases, the youth contributed to the support of the family; while 22.2% resided in public housing, 60.0% of the families received some sort of welfare assistance. Sixty percent of the enrollees had held a job for thirty days or more, almost all of them in the regular NYC program.

Thirteen youth (61.9%) completed the program. Of those who terminated, none dropped out of school. Four of the eight terminators found other private sector jobs, one quit the bank job, one declined to participate due to an adverse affect on his school performance, one was simply not interested, and one became pregnant. Four of the terminators graduated from high school.

Among completers, twelve graduated while the other youth was continuing in summer school to earn the diploma. Only one of the twelve was not working, although the bank had offered a full-time position.

The impact of VEPS upon academic performance was marginal in Las Vegas. Mean grade point average rose +0.09 from 2.58 to 2.67. Attendance deteriorated, however, by an average of one day. In three-quarters of the cases, grade point improved, compared to a decline in 12.5% of the cases. Almost the reverse occurs with attendance; only 28.6% improved while 71.4% declined. Once again, the association between grades and attendance is weak and borders on being inverse.

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

The Pittsburgh Board of Education sponsors the primary in-school NYC program in the City of Pittsburgh. Summer NYC programs are sponsored by the City, Board of Education, and the Catholic Archdiocesan school system. The Archdiocese also sponsors an in-school NYC program that operates in areas outside the City of Pittsburgh. Since the Pittsburgh Board of Education's NYC program had conducted a VEPS-I program, the VEPS-II program profited from the previous years experience. The report on VEPS-I program contains additional information on the Pittsburgh effort.

Administrative Structure and Staff

VEPS-II benefited from the Board of Education sponsorship of NYC in several ways. First, access to schools and school records was easier than it would have been for an outside agency. Second, the space for VEPS staff was in the Occupational-Vocational Training Center. This arrangement put the VEPS staff in direct contact with other personnel in Pittsburgh's vocational training programs.

A third advantage of Board of Education sponsorship in VEPS-II was the presence of the Select Employment Training program (SET) which was funded by the U.S. Office of Education. This program was directed toward the same types of students as VEPS but required that the private sector employers pay the entire amount of enrollee wages. Intensive counseling was provided through the Office of Education funding. When an employee did not want to be involved in any cost sharing arrangement such as VEPS, a training position could still be obtained using the SET program. On the other hand, when an employer balked at paying the wages for a student, the worksite might be secured for the VEPS program due to the 50-50 cost sharing arrangement.

Administratively, the director of placement supervising both VEPS and SET acted as the VEPS coordinator. He reported to the Director of the OVT Center and was in close contact with the NYC director. The NYC program was also housed at the OVT Center.

The staffing of VEPS and SET only overlapped to a slight degree. Three professional staff persons served as VEPS counselors; the SET program utilized two paraprofessionals. VEPS counselors were certified and had been in the school system previously. The VEPS counselors occasionally provided some assistance to SET and vice versa. There was some staff turnover during the year but it did not significantly affect the VEPS program.

Due to an accounting problem the Board of Education did not adopt the 50-50 cost sharing procedure for all hours worked. Instead, Pittsburgh used an equivalent arrangement. The NYC program paid all the wages for enrollees in the first half of the program and the employers paid the entire amount of the wages in the second half. This procedure could create difficulty if employers refused to pay when it was their turn or simply fired the youth. However, only one employer failed to pay his share of the wages.

Enrollee Selection

VEPS-II was targeted for sixty enrollees including some carryovers from the first year program. The NYC in-school program had 740 enrollees. The selection process was essentially unchanged from VEPS-I. High school counselors and NYC personnel were contacted regarding potential dropouts who could benefit from the work experience and counseling which VEPS provided. VEPS personnel checked academic records for grades and attendance information as a further indicator of probable dropout status.

Pittsburgh enrolled seventy youth from thirteen high schools and two junior highs. All were eligible for NYC. The mean grade point average for enrollees was 1.39 on a 4.0 scale. This was the lowest of the ten VEPS-II cities studied.* The average number of absences during the 1971-72 school year was 35 days. As in VEPS-I the program enrolled some educable mentally retarded students.

Thirty-one (44.3%) of the enrollees had participated in the VEPS-I program. Forty-one (58.6%) of the enrollees were male and twenty-nine female. As of July 1, 1972, thirty-two (45.7%) were 17 years old, fifteen (21.4%) were 16 and another fifteen were 18, four were under 16 and four were over 18. There were sixty-five black enrollees and five white. Forty-three (61.4%) enrollees were entering their senior year, while sixteen (22.9%) were entering their junior year. The remaining eleven students were sophomores or below.

Job Development

The carryover of thirty-one enrollees from the VEPS-I program meant that fewer new training stations were required. The VEPS counselors developed the jobs relying primarily on personal contacts. The existence of the SET program was a positive factor in job development with some interchange occurring between VEPS and SET.

The main selling point to the employers for both VEPS and SET was that the students would receive intensive counseling and follow-up services. This feature offset any reservations employers might have had about the type of students in the programs. The counselors made most contacts with smaller employers, although they had some success with larger employers. Several mailings to employers which presented a case history for several anonymous youth was attempted, but response rates were very low. However, several openings did result from this approach.

VEPS training sites were developed for sixty-nine enrollees. Over one-half (52.2%) of the employed enrollees were placed with employers having fewer than twenty full-time employees. Slightly over one-quarter (27.5%) were with firms having 20-49 workers, while one-fifth (20.3%) were in companies with over 50 employers. Enrollees' VEPS work experiences were concentrated in five general occupational categories: 29.0% trained as operatives; 21.7% service; 18.8% sales workers; 15.9% clerical; and 14.5% laborers.

*No academic data was available in Eugene, Oregon.

Slightly more than one-quarter (26.1%) had two work experiences and the other enrollees had one.

Pre-Job Orientation

Pre-job orientation was conducted in early August. The sessions were held daily for three hours for a three week period. The VEPS staff presented material from the VEPS Model as well as began an introduction to the topic of vocational choice.

The sessions followed closely the procedures used in VEPS-I. Discussion focused on the types of positions available, necessary world-of-work attitudes, completing application blanks and related subjects. A variety of materials available in the school system such as films and tape cassettes were used.

On-Going Counseling

This aspect of VEPS-II proved to be as difficult as it had been in VEPS-I. The problem was the number of situations requiring the counselors' attention. Pittsburgh had selected probable dropouts for the program aggressively and as a result had enrollees with the lowest initial grade point of the cities studied. The counselors worked with school, home, and work related problems of enrollees.

Pittsburgh was especially diligent in maintaining contact and trying to assist youth even if they left the VEPS program or dropped out of school. This added an important dimension to the program.

The counselors worked closely with school personnel to work out individual class schedules so that enrollees would be able to work during the in-school portion of VEPS. In checking the enrollees' schedule and records before placement counselors discovered several cases of youth who thought they were going to graduate, but would not have had enough credits. VEPS counselors were instrumental in alerting the youth and regular high school counselors and changing course schedules wherever possible.

Counseling contacts were usually made on an individual basis once and often twice per week. Most contacts occurred at the worksite, although a number were made at school or at home.

Vocational Exploration

Pittsburgh did not institute formal group sessions to present vocational exploration materials. They were faced with the same problems that were encountered in VEPS-I. First, the long distances and limited ability to travel rapidly was a problem in the metropolitan area. This is true for travel from school to the work station or a central meeting place. Second, the enrollees were disadvantaged youth with a number of problems. Regular counseling and crisis intervention took a great deal of time. When combined with job development efforts, little time was left for regular sessions.

Two years experience with VEPS has made clear the difficulties of implementing vocational exploration sessions. In Pittsburgh, the youth se-

lected for the program required too much other attention. Also, certain training sites were unwilling to allow the program counselor to control the enrollees scheduling at the worksite. Additionally, many employers feel that even with 50-50 cost sharing the enrollees have too many problems to make their employment truly profitable. Most viewed their participation as being evidence of their civic mindedness rather than strictly a business proposition.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

The Pittsburgh VEPS-II program enrolled seventy youth. All the enrollees were single and thirty-nine (55.7%) lived with their mothers, another 31.4% lived with both parents. In over three-fifths of the cases (61.4%) the household head was unemployed; 18.6% were working more than thirty-five hours per week and 20.0% were working less than thirty-five hours. Sixty percent of the enrollees resided in public housing and fifty percent were in families receiving public assistance. In spite of the above figures which indicate that the VEPS-II enrollees were from low-income families with a potential for difficulties, only eleven (15.9%) youth reported that they were contributing to the support of their families.

Most (68.6%) of the enrollees had worked prior to joining VEPS-II. Forty-three (61.4%) had held a job for more than thirty days. The general occupation of these positions was service (21), semi-skilled (16), clerical (4), and other (2).

Of the seventy VEPS enrollees, fifty-two (74.3%) completed the second year program. This total included thirty-two youth who completed VEPS-II and graduated from high school. As further indication of the impact of the program in aiding the youth in securing full-time employment following graduation, twenty-six enrollees who graduated were retained at their VEPS-II employers while two found other private sector employment and one found a public sector job. Of the other three completers who graduated, two were married and one joined the military service. Therefore, none of the graduating VEPS-II completers was in the not working category.

The disposition of all fifty-two VEPS-II completers was: remained at VEPS employer (44); other private sector employment (2); married (2); returned to NYC (2); military service (1); and public sector employment (1).

Eighteen (25.7%) youth terminated from the program during VEPS-II. Of the terminators, eight (11.4%) dropped out of school. Eight terminated and remained in school while two terminated and graduated from high school. The ten students who left the program, but did not drop out of school were fired from their VEPS position (7), and never had a VEPS job, married, and transferred to NYC (1 each). The eight school dropouts were equally divided between leaving school for employment and other reasons.

The Pittsburgh VEPS-II program also had a good record regarding academic performance. The data on improved academic performance was stronger with forty-one (67.2%) enrollees improving, four (6.6%) remaining the same and sixteen (26.2%) declining. The improvement ranged from ten (16.4%) who improved by +1.26 or more of a grade point to eleven (18.0%) who changed marginally between +.25 to -.25 of a grade point. Thirteen (21.3%) had an improvement of +.76 to +1.25 and a like number improved by +.26 to +.75.

Eleven (18.0%) had declines of $-.26$ to $-.75$ while only three had more severe declines.

As in other cities the attendance data was less positive. Twenty-nine (48.3%) enrollees improved and declined while two remained unchanged. Twenty of the improved performances were for ten days or more while eighteen of the declines were for ten days or more. Twelve students had slight changes of plus or minus three days during the year.

PUEBLO, COLORADO

Pueblo was another city whose first experience with the program was VEPS-II. The OEO-CAP agency in Pueblo sponsored the NYC program. The VEPS-II program was limited to the five high schools serving Pueblo.

Administrative Structure and Staff

The VEPS program was staffed by a coordinator who was responsible for all phases of program operation. The VEPS coordinator was located in the NYC office and reported to the NYC director. The coordinator's previous background was in youth work and counseling in community programs.

NYC administrative forms such as enrollee applications, time sheets and progress reports were used in VEPS. In addition to the regular file on each VEPS enrollee, the coordinator kept a detailed card record on each student. Close contact with the NYC program was maintained due to the VEPS location in the NYC offices. This contact facilitated other arrangements, such as enrollee transfers between VEPS and NYC.

The experience of the NYC program and the VEPS coordinator indicated that cooperation with the school system would be relatively good. One unanticipated problem arose in matching the enrollees' job interests to private sector positions. In several cases, such as an interest in counseling, the career interests of the enrollees could have been better served by placement in the public sector. Although the NYC program could enroll youth and place them in the public sector, it was not able to match the intensive counseling which VEPS provided. Program flexibility in job placement to accommodate such differences should be built into future program designs.

Enrollee Selection

Pueblo's VEPS program was targeted between thirty and forty youth. Selections for the group to receive orientation were made by the VEPS coordinator. A few students were enrolled after the initial group had been selected.

The VEPS coordinator focused on enrolling probable dropouts. The coordinator met with the high school counselors in each of five high schools during the summer. After outlining the goals of VEPS, each counselor provided a list of six students whose academic or family problems would qualify them for the program. Some of the factors considered were academic progress, high school adjustment problems and family difficulties. Eligibility for free school lunches was used as a preliminary indication of low-income status necessary to qualify for NYC.

After obtaining the names, the VEPS coordinator made personal contacts with the youth to explain the program and invite them to participate. As a result of this process, youth entering the program had a reasonable understanding of the program's objectives. At the same time, the VEPS coordi-

nator verified that the enrollees were eligible for NYC (many had participated in previous summer programs) and generally met the other VEPS guidelines.

Forty-one youth in Pueblo participated during the VEPS-II program year. Slightly under two-thirds (65.9%) of the enrollees were male. Almost one-half (48.8%) were seventeen years of age at the time of enrollment, another 31.7% were sixteen. Five enrollees (12.2%) were eighteen or older, while 7.3% were under sixteen. Enrollees with Spanish surnames accounted for 95.1% (39) of all enrollees; one was black and one white. A large majority (70.7%) of the enrollees were entering their senior year with the remaining enrollees going into their junior year. The VEPS coordinator anticipated that many of the seniors would retain their VEPS employment or go on to further education or training after the program.

Job Development

Pueblo encountered the same situation that existed in other VEPS cities, namely, that developing jobs with employers takes a considerable amount of personal contact and follow-up. This is especially true when explaining a relatively complex program such as VEPS to smaller employers who have not had previous contact with manpower programs.

The VEPS coordinator began job development in the summer and continued throughout the program year, except during the Department of Labor freeze on manpower program enrollments. Contacts were initiated by the coordinator among previous acquaintances as well as businesses which offered the type of training that matched enrollee interests. Job development was conducted in the morning during the period of the pre-job orientation sessions.

The coordinator felt that being female brought mixed results; sometimes helping secure training positions, but often obtaining polite refusals. This subjective judgment was tested somewhat late in the program year when an older man in the Public Employment Program was assigned to the coordinator to assist in job development. Working as a job development team his presence appeared to have a more favorable impact on potential employers than did the female VEPS coordinator.

Attempts were made to obtain positions in a wide range of firms both in terms of type and size. Greatest success was achieved with smaller businesses; this is partially a result of the type of businesses in Pueblo. The recommendations on implementing the VEPS-II guidelines suggested concentrating on smaller employers, and Pueblo VEPS followed that advice. Smaller employers also fit well with the coordinator's interest in matching jobs to enrollee interests and gaining access for counseling follow-up.

VEPS work sites were developed for thirty-six enrollees. Three-quarters of the enrollees (27) were placed with employers having fewer than ten full-time employees. The other nine enrollees were scattered in the other employer size classes from 10-19 to 100 and over. The job classifications for the enrollee's VEPS work experience were as follows: 36.6% in the operatives category; 14.6% in laborers; 12.2% each in clerical and kindred workers and service workers; 7.3% craftsman and 4.9% sales workers. Over

four-fifths of the enrollees (83.3%) remained with one employer during their program participation (which may have been less than the full program year), while 16.7% had two or more work experiences.

Pre-Job Orientation

The VEPS coordinator conducted the pre-job orientation program for the enrollees. The entire enrollee group met for the sessions which were held for several hours each afternoon for two weeks. Attendance was good because of the coordinator's initial explanation of the program during recruitment and intensive follow-up.

The sample orientation materials contained in the VEPS Model were used extensively. Special attention was focused on filling out the sample application forms and role playing for job interviews. In addition, several guest speakers made presentations concerning career choice, educational opportunities beyond high school and community social service resources.

On-Going Counseling

Counseling contacts were maintained primarily at the work site and through home visits. Less frequent contacts were made at school and at the NYC office. The VEPS coordinator worked regular counseling contacts into her schedule of continuing job development. Counseling at the job site was often coupled with handling time sheet and payroll matters.

Most of the counseling problems involved job related matters, although school and family problems were also encountered. Several enrollees were involved in traffic offenses during the year, and the coordinator assisted these youth in their court appearances.

Vocational Exploration

The vocational exploration component was not implemented through formal sessions. Instead, the coordinator aided the youth in enrolling in the regular high school vocational program where these classes matched the enrollees' interests or VEPS work experience. In a number of cases the enrollees were able to secure high school credit for their participation in the VEPS program.

The coordinator devoted a significant portion of her time to working with the enrollees to enable them to pursue further training in their chosen career area. These efforts resulted in a number of VEPS enrollees pursuing vocationally related programs at junior colleges and others going into apprenticeship programs. In most of these cases the enrollees were able to retain their VEPS employment while continuing their training.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

A total of forty-one youth were enrolled in the Pueblo VEPS program. Two of the youth were married. Slightly over two-fifths (41.5%) of the enrollees lived with both parents and 39.0% were living with their mother only. The head of the household was unemployed in 77.5% of the cases, while the other 22.5% were working more than 35 hours per week. Over two-thirds of the youth contributed to the support of their family; although

only 15.0% lived in public housing, two-thirds of the families received some form of welfare assistance. Most of the enrollees (90.2%) had held a job for more than thirty days, but this was usually in the NYC program. Clerical and service occupations accounted for over half of these previous jobs.

Of the forty-one enrollees, sixteen (39.0%) completed the full year program. Ten (24.4%) of the enrollees who terminated dropped out of school. The fifteen who terminated but remained in school (eleven of whom graduated) left VEPS for a wide range of reasons. Three quit their work stations and two each found another job, moved from Pueblo and transferred to NYC. The other six left for reasons such as lack of interest, marriage and illness. Three of the ten enrollees who dropped out of school did so to be married, two left for full-time jobs and five for other reasons.

Sixteen students completed the VEPS program. Of the completers, eight (50.0%) remained at their VEPS employer; two went into military service; one continued his education; two returned to the NYC program; and three had other outcomes. None of the completers were in the not working category.

The academic and attendance data on Pueblo completers is not complete because some enrollees were in a special school program which were ungraded. In two cases, records from the year prior to VEPS were unavailable due to incomplete transfer records.

One-half of the ten VEPS completers with available information improved their grade point average and half declined. Four improved by +.26 to +.75 of a point; four had marginal changes of +.25 to -.25; and two had declines of 1.25 grade points. Attendance data was more favorable with all but two enrollees showing improvement. Three improved by more than ten days while only one declined by that much.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

The sponsorship of VEPS-II in Salt Lake City shifted from the Salt Lake City Board of Education which had sponsored VEPS-I to the OEO-CAP sponsored NYC program. This change was not accomplished without some difficulty and staff turnover. The overall impact was to create some initial problems during the transition while staff were being replaced. The report on VEPS-I contains additional information on Salt Lake City's VEPS effort.

Administrative Structure and Staff

VEPS-II continued to serve four school districts after the NYC program sponsored by the local community action agency took over administration of VEPS. The school districts in VEPS-II were Salt Lake City, Jordan, Granite, and Murray.

As a result of the changeover, the VEPS office was moved from the Salt Lake City Board of Education offices to space in the NYC offices which were in the main office of the community action agency. This change improved communications between the NYC director and the VEPS coordinator, although these had been good during the VEPS-I program year.

A more difficult problem was the changeover in VEPS project staff. Several of the counselors became concerned that there would not be a second year of VEPS. Since they did not have tenure with the school system and were not employees of the NYC program, they sought positions elsewhere. In addition, the VEPS-I coordinator elected to remain in a tenured position with the school system.

VEPS-II did not lose all continuity since the new coordinator had been a counselor in the first year program. The coordinator reported to the NYC director. The counseling staff was built back up in the fall with the addition of two persons with some previous youth counseling experience. The transition in the late summer caused a reduction in counseling effectiveness at that time.

Once the program was clearly shifted to NYC, there were several benefits. NYC had been working with schools for some time and the access to high school counselors was no more difficult than under Board of Education sponsorship. NYC was more flexible on some matters such as payroll procedures than the Board of Education had been. Expense and budget information was centralized in the hands of the NYC directors.

The new 50-50 cost sharing arrangements were adopted for all work stations including employers who had participated in VEPS-I. Payroll procedures for new work stations were changed so that enrollees were paid on the company payroll with NYC reimbursing the companies for their share of costs. This change had been suggested in the VEPS Model to provide a closer identification between the enrollee and the worksite. Enrollees carried over from VEPS-I were retained on the NYC payroll and their employers reimbursed

NYC. The time sheets and payroll checks for enrollees on the NYC payroll were handled bi-weekly. Time records for reimbursing enrollees on company payrolls were collected monthly.

Enrollee Selection

VEPS-II enrollee were recruited from sixteen of the eighteen high schools in the participating school districts. Since the VEPS-I counselors were to be employed through the summer using unexpended funds, they began the selection process in May, 1972. The academic and vocational counselors in the high schools were contacted by the VEPS counselors to determine students who might be potential dropouts.

The VEPS counselors also obtained lists of students whose fees had been waived to aid the counselors in recruiting low-income students. The selection process did not use records of grades or attendance, but relied on the VEPS and high school counselors' knowledge of students who could benefit from program participation.

VEPS had 122 enrollees during the entire program year. However, initial recruiting was targeted for one hundred slots. This number was in line with the number served in VEPS-I program and below the 130 in school NYC enrollees. The VEPS-II coordinator was responsible for all enrollees. In addition, enrollees in Salt Lake City more than elsewhere left VEPS due to conflicts with their academic work or other school activities. This may be attributed in part to trying to work with several different school districts.

Sixty-six (54.1%) of the 122 enrollees served during the year were male. Fifty-four (44.3%) enrollees were sixteen years old, forty-three (35.2%) were seventeen; fourteen (11.5%) were fifteen or under, and eleven (9.0%) were eighteen years old. Eighty-five (69.7%) were white, nineteen (15.6%) had Spanish surnames, thirteen (10.7%) were black and five (4.1%) had other ethnic backgrounds. Students entering their junior year accounted for 53.3% of the enrollees and 44.3% were moving into their senior year while 2.5% were to be sophomores.

Job Development

The job development task was reduced by the carryover of forty-one enrollees from the VEPS-I program. Most of these enrollees remained with their VEPS-I employer. The remaining job slots were developed by the VEPS staff using personal contacts and employer canvassing. These procedures produced the suggested emphasis on smaller employers.

Worksites were developed for all 122 enrollees during the VEPS-II year. Over two-fifths (42.6%) of the enrollees were in small business employing fewer than five full-time workers. Training stations with 5-9 full-time workers employed 15.6% of the enrollees with and additional 16.4% in firms having 10-19 employees. Ninety-one (74.6%) of the VEPS enrollees were in companies having fewer than twenty full-time employers. Twenty-three (18.9%) were with companies employing 20-49 and eight (6.6%) with firms having 50 or more employees. The general occupational categories in which enrollees receiving training were: 27.9% as clerical workers;

24.6% operations; 14.8% service workers; 13.9% laborers; 10.7% sales workers and 8.2% craftsmen. Approximately three-fifths (61.5%) of the enrollees had one work experience in VEPS-II, 27.0% had two, and 11.5% had three.

Pre-Job Orientation

A formal pre-job orientation program was presented for the fifty-nine new enrollees who had not participated in VEPS-I. Ten four-hour sessions were conducted in three high schools over a two week period. This represented a major change from the first year when no pre-job orientation sessions were held.

The VEPS counselors conducted most of the sessions using materials from the previous year's vocational exploration workshops and other topics from the VEPS Model. In addition to covering the necessary world-of-work concerns, the pre-job orientation program began vocation exploration for the enrollees. Speakers from business and industry were used to describe careers that were available.

The information usually included a general assessment of entry level requirements and demand in the Salt Lake City area.

On-Going Counseling

Salt Lake City VEPS-II employed the same techniques that had been used the first year. Most of the counseling (as opposed to the vocational exploration sessions discussed below) contacts were on a one-to-one basis. Counselors would meet with the enrollee at school or on-the-job.

The counselors met with participating employers at least once each month. Also, a minimum of three home visits were scheduled for the year. Enrollees faced personal problems similar to youth in other cities. Transportation was one problem that appeared more severe in the Salt Lake City area. The dispersal of enrollees among several school districts and the resulting difficulty in locating positions close to the enrollees' homes required additional time of the counselors. The counselors provided remediation especially in English and math for some of the enrollees.

Vocational Exploration

Vocational exploration sessions were conducted monthly between October and April. Each month the same session was repeated at three high schools. Since the sessions had been started in VEPS-I most of the employers were aware of them prior to the start of school.

The sessions continued and expanded upon the materials presented during pre-job orientation. Guest speakers were used although the counselors conducted the majority of the meetings. The counselors worked with the school districts to obtain high school credit for the VEPS experience. Approximately one-third of the enrollees received credit; many did not need any extra credits to graduate.

Attendance at the exploration sessions was required. A few enrollees were terminated after they missed three sessions.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

Salt Lake City's VEPS program enrolled 122 youth during its second year. All but two enrollees were single. Fifty-seven (46.7%) lived with both parents and another 40.2% lived with their mother only. The remaining sixteen enrollees lived with a guardian (9) or other arrangements (7). In fifty (48.5%) of the cases, the household head was not working while in forty-four (42.7%) cases the head was working more than thirty-five hours per week. Thirty-two enrollees responded that they contributed to the support of their families. Only eleven enrollees lived in public housing. Thirty-four (28.8%) were in families receiving some form of welfare assistance.

Sixty (61.2%) enrollees had worked previous to their VEPS experience. Of the sixty, forty-five had held a job for more than thirty days. The general occupational classification for these positions were service (36.6%), semi-skilled (17.0%), agriculture (9.8%), clerical (7.3%), sales (2.4%), and other (26.8%).

Fifty-four (44.3%) of the 122 enrollees completed the second year VEPS program. Twenty-five of the VEPS-II completers also graduated from high school. Of the high school graduates, thirteen (52.0%) were retained at their VEPS employer while seven (28.0%) found other private sector employment. Four (16.0%) completers who graduated were not working and one moved out of the Salt Lake City area. Forty-five of the fifty-four program completers either remained with their VEPS employer or found other private sector employment. Eight were not working and one had left the area.

Seventy-eight youth terminated during the program year. Only eleven (9.0%) of the enrollees who left VEPS dropped out of school. Fourteen of the terminated enrollees graduated from high school. Other than dropping out of school the most often cited reasons for leaving VEPS were lack of interest (ten); affected academic performance (nine); found another job (eight) and quit (seven). No reason was mentioned more than four times.

The academic data revealed that thirty-two (59.3% of the fifty-four completers) enrollees improved their grade point average while twenty-one (38.9%) declined and one remained unchanged. Seven (13.0%) completers improved by +.76 of a grade point or more while only three (5.6%) dropped by as much. Sixteen (29.6%) improved by +.26 to +.75 and 10 (18.5%) declined by -.26 to -.75. The grade point average for eighteen (33.3%) enrollees changed in the narrow range +.25 to -.25.

Attendance data was more difficult to obtain. Records on twenty-nine program completers indicate that fifteen improved, thirteen declined, and one remained unchanged. This pattern of less favorable performance in the attendance indicator was observed in other cities. Fourteen of the enrollees had a change in absences between plus and minus three days. Nine improved by four days or more while six declined by at least four days.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA

The Office of the County Superintendent of Schools is the NYC sponsor; San Bernardino County includes sixteen school districts. Individual school districts subcontract for the operation of the NYC programs through the County Office. The County also provides special services and programs for participating school districts and maintains an extensive career exploration capability in personnel, hardware and software, and library. The County Office is well financed and staffed, and the services it renders are generally excellent. San Bernardino County NYC participated in the VEPS-I program (1971-72), and the experience gained permitted easy transition to VEPS-II; only San Bernardino City Unified School District was involved in the VEPS-I program. In VEPS-II eight other school districts were involved: Yucaipa, Fontanna, Colton, Chaffey, Rialto, Chino, Barstow, and Victor Valley.

Administrative Structure and Staff

The San Bernardino VEPS program was facilitated by two programmatic factors: (1) prior experience of the County Schools with NYC and vocational education projects; and (2) prior experience with the first-year VEPS program. With the exception of private sector worksites, the regular NYC program had, prior to 1971, incorporated much of the VEPS concept. Thus, the transition to VEPS was relatively simple. Few administrative problems developed since program administration, counselor supervision, and enrollee work records were centralized with the County Schools. Enrollee academic records were maintained by the individual school districts, while counseling reports, internal monitoring, and enrollee assessments by counselors and employers were centralized with the County NYC/VEPS coordinator.

Eighteen high schools were involved from the nine participating school districts. Excellent coordination and cooperation was attained with regular school personnel. Since the Office of County Schools had previously handled all special and NYC programs, the question of direction and administrative control never arose.

Payroll procedures were administered by NYC. Enrollees received two checks, one representing the fifty percent private sector share and the other the fifty percent NYC. The wage sharing feature proved very attractive to employers and did facilitate job development. Early release from classes, high school graduation credit for work experience, and tailored curriculum changes were standard aspects of the program.

In addition to the NYC director and the VEPS coordinator, four full-time counselors were utilized in the program. One counselor was placed in San Bernardino; others were located in Colton, Chaffey and Yucaipa. There was turnover in one of the counselor positions during the course of the program. One of the counselors had participated in the VEPS-I program and was continued

in VEPS-II with DOL funding. The other counselors were hired through funds made available through the Public Employment Program. The VEPS coordinator was provided by San Bernardino County. Job specifications were prepared and distributed through the Human Resources Development Agency which is the state employment agency. Approximately fifteen applicants were processed through interviews. None of the counselors were certified, although one had embarked on certification training. No problems were encountered with state regulations.

The VEPS coordinator held regular weekly meetings with the counseling staff, and also communicated with the NYC director on a regular weekly basis. Full staff meetings were held once a month.

The experience of San Bernardino County with the prior VEPS program greatly eased the implementation of the VEPS-II program. Adequate and frequent communication among the staff was the rule, and the counselors were provided with adequate flexibility in conducting the program. The geographic spread of the program did create some coordination problems.

Enrollee Selection

The VEPS program in San Bernardino County, initially targeted for between 100 and 150 youth, did enroll 125. The enrollee selection process began in late May and early June. All enrollees were drawn from previous NYC rolls; two enrollees carried over from VEPS-I. Potential enrollees for the program were selected on the basis of their academic performance, incidence of school related problems, and whether the youth was currently unemployed or underemployed, or employed in non-meaningful work. Less emphasis was placed on academic indicators in order to improve acceptability to employers. Although the enrollees did not strictly represent probable dropouts, the youth were chosen from the lower end of the scale in terms of family income. Each of the youth was personally interviewed by the counselor before acceptance into the program. Counselors selected back-up youth to replace any who might drop out of the program.

In the selection process VEPS counselors did contact parents to solicit their approval of the VEPS program and to secure their cooperation in its implementation; home contact was made immediately prior to job placement. The decreased emphasis on the dropout criterion is reflected in the baseline academic indicators used in this study. Mean grade point average for the enrollees was 2.31 on a 4.0 scale. Absence rate averaged eleven days. Of the 125 youth, 42.4% were male. Most (48.8%) were age sixteen at time of enrollment, and 39.2% were age fifteen. All youth met the minimum age at the time of job placement. A plurality (40.8%) were white, while 36.8% had a Spanish surname and 22.4% were black. Reflecting the youth age, only 15.2% had completed their junior year; 68.8% had completed their sophomore, and 13.6% their freshman.

Job Development

Job development was conducted by the VEPS counselors, assisted at times by the VEPS coordinator. In San Bernardino, twenty-five employers who had

participated in VEPS-I carried over into VEPS-II. No assistance from NAB or the Chamber of Commerce was received directly. In the other areas, job development faced competition from other programs, and some suspicion of VEPS was apparent among the regular work experience personnel. As a consequence, VEPS counselors did not attempt to recruit placements from regular work experience job sites.

The wage sharing feature proved a strong selling point, particularly in the outlying areas. Job developers used many of the normal tactics such as telephone contact and door-to-door solicitation. To aid the development process, the program developed and distributed descriptive flyers; these proved to be quite useful. An employer agreement form was also used which eliminated all but a few cases of employer misunderstanding about the program.

Some transportation difficulties were found in the outlying areas due to a lack of adequate public transportation. School and work hours were adjusted to make use of the school bus schedules, and many youth had access to automobiles. Most of the youth were placed by the beginning of school; those who had not been placed were held on NYC work stations until a suitable position could be found. Counselors maintained weekly contact with employers by visiting the work station; this was supplemented by frequent, but irregular telephone contact.

Two-thirds of the work stations were with employers having fewer than twenty full-time employees, while 80.8% were at sites with fewer than thirty. Nearly a third of the sites were in the range of ten to nineteen full-time employees. Over one-third (33.6%) of the positions were clerical in nature, while 16.8% were operatives, 15.2% service workers, and 14.4% sales. The majority of youth (79.2%) remained at the same employer throughout the experience, while 19.2% had two work stations. The usual occupational titles were well represented, but among the more unusual work stations were those in roofing, upholstery, candle making, book binding, floral arranging, advertising, machine repairing, and carpet laying.

Pre-Job Orientation

The sixty hour orientation session began on July 1 and was based on the VEPS-I experience. Counselors found that most of the youth were prepared for job placement within about twenty-five hours. Both individual and small group sessions were utilized, with groups numbering no larger than ten youth. The orientation was handled by the counselors but was based on an instructional package prepared by the VEPS coordinator. Enrollees tended to be reticent at first, but as the sessions progressed, they tended to open up and participate. Sessions were usually held in the school buildings. The content of the orientation involved the usual world-of-work aspects and stressed interpersonal relationships. The lecture-discussion model was supplemented with film strips, other audio-visual approaches, and written materials. Enrollee interests and aptitudes were profiled, and career interests were determined.

On-Going Counseling

An extensive on-going counseling routine was implemented. During the summer, contact with the enrollees was made primarily at the work site, while

the in-school phase spread contact among school, home and work. To avoid problems which had appeared in VEPS-I, the attempt was made to inform the regular school counseling staff about the VEPS program. Home visits were made on a two per semester basis, except where individual cases required more intensive visitation. Contact at the work site was done on a weekly basis.

To supplement the usual counseling routine, special problems and needs were handled through supplemental aids available through the school system. These included remedial teachers, medical personnel, and social workers. VEPS counselors tracked each youth closely in an attempt to handle problems before they reached the serious stage. Employers were urged to contact the counselor whenever they felt the need, although in some cases counselors found this to be a substitute for direct contact with the youth. When necessary, youth were called out of class; school officials cooperated in this approach, and counselors attempted to vary their time of contact to avoid too many removals from a single class.

Vocational Exploration

San Bernardino County possesses an extensive hardware and software capability for vocational education. These holdings were made available to the counseling staff and to the youth. Each of the participating high schools had a guidance center, although the individual capabilities varied greatly. Extensive use was made of these centers in assisting VEPS youth in exploring various occupational interests. Enrollee interests were identified early in the program, and counselors explored these early interests in detail. As desires changed, so did the counseling.

To supplement those centers which were not as well equipped, a mobile van was utilized. The van was equipped with substantial audio-visual and job inventory equipment. VEPS youth were given first priority in the use of this equipment, although the unit was available to the entire student body. Enrollees were brought out of regular classes to use the van and attend guidance sessions. The vocational exploration component was handled entirely by the individual counselor for his group of enrollees.

In addition to the school and van based capability, use was made of outside speakers, field trips, and the like. The individualized approach of the counselors, the career inventories and skill aptitudes, and the ample hardware and software career education capability of the program blended to make for an excellent vocational exploration component.

Indicators of Programmatic Impact

A total of 125 youth were enrolled in the San Bernardino VEPS program, although five of these never worked at a VEPS job. Only one of the youth was married. Unlike most other VEPS programs, a plurality (48.0%) lived with both parents and only 40.8% came from a female-headed household. Less than half of the household heads (41.6%) were unemployed and another 25.6% were underemployed, working less than thirty-five hours per week. Over two-thirds of the enrollees contributed to the support of the family; while 8.1% lived in public housing, 53.0% of the families received some form of

welfare assistance. Most of the youth (94.8%) had worked for thirty days or more, but as was the case in other VEPS programs, this work experience was largely confined to the regular NYC program.

Of the 125 enrollees, 62 (49.6%) completed the program. Of the 63 youth who terminated, only nine (7.2%) dropped out of school. Youth who terminated did so for a wide variety of reasons. Seventeen either quit, were laid off, or never appeared for the job; three more were not interested. Five found other jobs and another five moved from the community. Six experienced conflict with other school activities, and nine transferred to NYC. Seven of the terminators graduated from high school. No reason could be obtained for six of the nine school dropouts; the remainder either became pregnant, got married, or ran away from home.

Of the VEPS completers, 50 (80.7%) remained at the VEPS employer; three found other private sector work, four continued their education, and one joined the military. Three of the completers returned to NYC, and no information could be gotten for one enrollee. Ten of the VEPS completers graduated from high school; six of these remained at their VEPS employer and the remaining four went on to higher education. As with the VEPS-I program, a high percentage of youth were maintained by the private sector VEPS employers.

As with a number of other cities, the impact of VEPS upon academic performance is mixed. For completers, the mean grade point average rose slightly from 2.41 to 2.44; 59.3% improved in grade point average while 40.7% declined. In attendance, mean absences increased one day; a plurality (48.7%) declined while 35.9% improved. The disassociation between performance on grade point and attendance is clear in San Bernardino as it was in numerous other VEPS programs.

APPENDIX A

In reply refer
to MEHOW

U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Washington, D. C. 20210

May 14, 1971

FIELD MEMORANDUM NO. 183-71

TO: ALL REGIONAL MANPOWER ADMINISTRATORS

SUBJECT: Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector-Pilot Neighborhood
Youth Corps Program with National Alliance of Businessmen

The program description for a pilot program for Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) enrollees developed cooperatively by the Department of Labor, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the National Alliance of Businessmen is attached.

Local NYC sponsors will select enrollees and pay wages for a portion of enrollee time in the program, provide remedial services, and perform administrative duties. The Office of Education will provide funding for counseling and remedial education and will develop a Vocational Guidance Institute in connection with the program. NAB through its local Metro Directors will select and work with private sector companies who will provide vocational exploration worksites.

If you need any additional information regarding the program described in the attachment to this memorandum, please send them to my office (Attn: MEHOW), or call the Division of Work Experience Programs, 202 - 961-3380.

J. L. BLAKE
Deputy Manpower Administrator

Attachment: (RMA's and Executive Staff)
Pilot Cover Exploration and Training Program

PILOT CAREER EXPLORATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this program is to provide selected in-school youth with career exploration and training opportunities which will result in reduction of the high school drop-out rate and the flow of untrained, unskilled people into the labor market. The resources and know-how of the private sector, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Education will be combined to give eligible in-school youth opportunities to develop or further their career interests within both the educational community and private sector. Factors which can be related to the success of the program will be isolated and incorporated into program models.

OBJECTIVES

--To provide economically disadvantaged students with skills enabling them upon graduation from high school to move on to further education or a job in the private sector.

--To demonstrate that the private sector, local school systems and government agencies can effectively coordinate their individual efforts in providing youth with meaningful career exploration and training experiences, and to develop innovative program models for these experiences.

--To help disadvantaged students experience achievement and learn the value of education and training as preparation for the world of work.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Primary responsibility for program development rests with the NYC sponsor, local school system and the local business community. Wherever possible and desirable, organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), the Community Action Agency and the State Employment Service may be consulted in developing the program.

Primary emphasis shall be placed on developing training and career exploration opportunities that will provide enrollees with the widest possible exposure to the world of work. Training assignments should relate directly to the students' interest and capabilities, and should be in concert with their educational goals.

a. Role of the National Alliance of Businessmen

The local Metro office of the National Alliance of Businessmen will select private sector business concerns willing to participate in this program. Primary consideration should be given to those companies that have

a proven training capability, i.e. those which have been contractually involved in the NAB program, those with qualified training programs, and those which have conducted awareness training programs for their supervisory personnel.

(1) Selection of Private Sector Participants. The NAB Metro office shall identify and invite into the program those private sector companies which have demonstrated an interest in training and employing in-school youth, and possess the capability of effectively training new personnel. As conditions for participating in this program, a company must agree to the following (a) provide, at its own cost, necessary staff, space, equipment, supplies and access to the principal worksites, (b) make said resources available to enrollees and school system counselors, and (c) absorb the salaries of enrollees when NYC funding phase terminates beginning the seventh week of the summer, the sixteenth week of the first semester, and the eleventh week of the second semester.. It is hoped that after an enrollee completes the three work experiences, one of the participating companies will make an effort to employ him part-time during after-school hours until he graduates from high school. Companies must assure that participation of enrollees will not result in the displacement of employed workers or result in the substitution of these enrollees for regular workers who would normally be hired.

(2) Responsibilities of Private Sector Participants

a. Identify private sector training and employment positions for eligible youth.

b. Develop student-oriented career exploration curricula with local school officials.

c. Designate personnel who will devote sufficient time to training and working with eligible youth, in cooperation with high school personnel assigned to private sector.

d. Cooperate with the NYC sponsor in establishing payroll procedures governing the period of training when the employer bears the full cost of the student's training salary.

e. Execute a Letter of Agreement with the NYC sponsor covering the above responsibilities and the conditions for participation listed under (1) above and agreeing not to hire for full-time employment any enrollees entering this program until they have been graduated from high school.

f. Participating companies shall designate a Company Coordinator (ideally from the corporate training staff) who shall assist the NYC sponsor and/or school system personnel in developing the career exploration and training curriculum. Prior to the implementation of the program in a company, the Company Coordinator will acquaint the pertinent supervisors and employees about the

basic objectives of the program as a means of assuring a positive working relationship between enrollees and company personnel with whom they will work.

(3) Career Exploration and Training Components. The Career Exploration and Training phase shall include four major components: counseling and remediation, orientation, career exploration and on-the-job training.

a. Counseling and Remediation. The counseling and remediation component is designed to provide enrollees with the motivation and basic educational skills needed to function effectively in a work environment, major responsibility for implementing this phase of the program rests with school system counselors.

Counseling and remediation sessions will be conducted in facilities mutually agreed upon by the NYC sponsor, participating company, and school system.

b. Orientation. The orientation component is designed to acquaint eligible youth with the basic facts about the world of work, the participating company's business, the American business and industrial system, the role of the employee within the economic system, the students' primary objectives while in the program, and the company's interest in the program. Supervision will be provided at all times by the Company Coordinator or staff he designates. Management level personnel should participate in orientation presentations and discussion sessions.

This component will be conducted in group sessions and will utilize panel discussion; question and answer sessions; media such as films, tapes, slides; oral presentations and tours of company facilities.

The curriculum in each company should include specific information on income and Social Security withholding procedures, the role of unions in company labor-management relations, the meaning to the individual employee of various Federal and State laws affecting the labor-management relations, employment trends within the company and the industry, the company's efforts in the equal opportunity area and safety rules and procedures as they apply to youth. The latter will be related to actual jobs when enrollees observe employees at work in the career exploration component and any safety devices utilized will be explained.

c. Career Exploration. The career exploration component is designed to provide eligible youth with an opportunity to become familiar with the variety of jobs in the business, to directly observe employees in the working environment, to question those employees about the training and education needed to perform the pertinent skills, and to discuss the rewards arising from employment and the possibility for upward mobility within a given skill area.

Career exploration will involve closely supervised observation of employees at work and will include explanation of appropriate safety procedures and laws as they apply to youth in the particular job. It will also involve discussions with employees at the job site unless for reasons of safety or efficiency another location in the company is used.

d. On-the-Job Training. The On-the-Job Training component will provide close supervision of enrollees at all times and will involve the learning of basic job skills and the application of learned skills in actual work. The OJT component of the "NYC phase" will be devoted to the teaching of basic job skills which may be applied by enrollees to the production of goods and services in the "employer phase". The OJT component in any "NYC phase" shall not exceed 25% of the hours involved in that "NYC phase."

e. Compliance With Fair Labor Standards Act and Pertinent State and Local Legislation. Employers shall comply with the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and pertinent State or local laws regarding the training and employment of youth.

b. Role of the NYC Sponsor

The NYC sponsor will recruit disadvantaged students who are at least 16 years of age and moving from tenth to eleventh grade and who qualify for admission into the NYC program. The sponsor will administer the program and will provide needed supportive and when necessary transportation services for enrollees. Each enrollee shall be limited to three separate work experiences under this program; each experience shall be limited to one summer or one semester.

(1) Recruitment of Students. The NYC sponsor will identify in-school youth at least 16 years of age who are economically disadvantaged (as defined by NYC guidelines) and refer same to the appropriate high school counselors who shall determine which students have been passed from tenth to eleventh grade and are probable drop-outs. An enrollee will be selected for the entire program and will not be replaced by another enrollee after the third week of summer if he decides to leave the program before completion of three experiences. The slot vacated will revert to the regular NYC program and should be filled. When selected, but prior to assignment to a private sector company, enrollees shall agree to the following:

- a. Maintain at least a passing grade in school year courses.
- b. Work to the best of their ability in school and on-the-job.
- c. Abide by the basic procedures governing this program as established by the school system and the employer.
- d. Consult their counselors on a regular basis as determined by each student, school officials and employers.

e. Agree not to seek employment from any employer participating in this program until graduation from high school, or until offered a work assignment by either the NYC sponsor, the local school system or NAB.

(2) Program Administration. The NYC sponsor designated by the Regional Manpower Administrator shall be responsible for program administration which shall include but not be limited to:

a. Keeping pertinent records.

b. Drawing and disbursing NYC wage payments to enrollees. (The NYC sponsor may elect to disburse enrollee wage payments provided by employers).

c. Maintain liaison with company coordinators and school system personnel. (Where school system is the sponsor close liaison should be maintained internally between the project staff and enrollee's home school).

d. Establish a regular working relationship with the local NAB office to provide maximum opportunity for joint monitoring and evaluation of the program.

e. Establish a Review Committee composed of selected enrollees, school system personnel, employers, NAB personnel and representatives of the NYC sponsor to review enrollee grievances and forward recommendations to the appropriate employer.

c. Role of the Local School System

The Local School System will be responsible for developing and implementing the counseling and remedial education component which will provide counseling personnel for this program. It will also have responsibility for developing a grading procedure for granting appropriate academic credits to enrollees.

Counselors assigned to the program will work with students in-school and at the private sector worksites. They will identify the probable drop-out from the list of students referred by the NYC sponsor, will assist the NYC sponsor and employer in developing the various components of the program, and will cooperate with private sector employers in implementing the career exploration and training functions.

Counselors will be assigned to this program on a full time basis. Wherever possible, the counselor-student ratio pertaining to this program shall be maintained at 1:20 from funds provided by the Office of Education.

The involvement of counselors in the private sector phase of the program is especially important since they assist private sector personnel in working with eligible youth, and can increase their own understanding of employment opportunities in the private sector and employer expectations regarding high school graduates entering the job market.

Throughout the implementation phase of this program, counselors will be in contact with their colleagues and can exchange with them information about the program and its results. The "feed back" process could result in the "re-education" of numerous counselors and teachers not able to participate directly in the program.

In selecting counseling staff every effort should be made to designate personnel who understand the "life style" of economically disadvantaged youth and who know how to relate to probable drop-outs.

FUNCTIONAL TIME FRAME

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Summer '71</u>	<u>First Semester</u>	<u>Second Semester</u>
NYC ¹	Counseling	56 hours	45 hours	30 hours
	Remediation	48	35	12
	Introduction to the World of Work	4	4	4
	Introduction to the Sponsoring Company ²	7	7	7
	Tour of Company Facilities. (Includes review of Safety Programs and Procedures)	7	7	7
	Career Exploration (Discussion Groups Involving Management and Professional Personnel)	17	26	22
	Job/Skill Observation of Line and Staff Positions	28	48	35
	Non-productive OJT	46	45	30
	Evaluation Sessions Involving Counselors and Company Coordinators			
	TOTAL HOURS	234	225	150
EMPLOYER ³	Training & Productive OJT	234 hours	60 hours	135 hours

- NOTES: ¹The Prime NYC sponsor will provide wages for all non-productive work outlined in the "NYC phase".
²Enrollees are required by NYC guidelines to change worksites for each segment. Worksite changes may involve moving from one company to another, or only moving from one job to another in the same company. Where movement within the same company occurs, the hours allotted for this function may be added to either the Career Exploration function or the Job/Skill Observation function.
³Employers will provide wages for enrollees in the "employer phase".

PILOT CAREER EXPLORATION & TRAINING PROGRAM

SCHEDULE

Summer

39 hours per week	12 weeks	6 NYC	6 employer
-------------------	----------	-------	------------

First School Semester

15 hours per week	19 weeks	15 NYC	4 employer
-------------------	----------	--------	------------

Second School Semester

15 hours per week	19 weeks	10 NYC	9 employer
-------------------	----------	--------	------------

APPENDIX B

In reply refer
to MDTW

U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Washington, D. C. 20210

May 12, 1972

FIELD MEMORANDUM NO. 195-72

TO: ALL REGIONAL MANPOWER ADMINISTRATORS

SUBJECT: Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector, A Pilot
Neighborhood Youth Corps Program

REFERENCES: Field Memorandums 183-71, 179-72.

1. Purpose. To provide instructions for the continuation and expansion of the Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) program along with the 1972-73 VEPS guidelines (See Attachment I).

2. Background. VEPS originated in summer 1971 as a one-year pilot program for Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) summer and in-school enrollees (See Field Memorandum 183-71 for the 1971-72 guidelines). The program was a joint effort between the Department of Labor, the Office of Education, and the National Alliance of Businessmen. Nine of these projects are in operation.

3. Action Required.

a. Regional Manpower Administrators (RMAs) may offer the 1972-73 VEPS program to the following nine cities which operated the 1971-72 VEPS program: Region I - Haverhill and Lawrence, Massachusetts; Region III - Norfolk, Virginia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Region V - Columbus, Ohio and Flint, Michigan; Region VI - Fort Worth, Texas; Region VIII - Salt Lake City, Utah; Region IX - San Bernadino, California. In addition, RMAs in Regions I, III, V, VI, VIII, IX and D.C. MA may offer the program to one other city per region, and RMAs in II, IV, VII, and X may offer the program to two cities per region. RMAs should give preference to a city which has an expressed interest in operating a VEPS program.

b. Field Memorandum 179-72 provides reporting instructions for the summer phase of VEPS as well as other NYC summer models. These instructions as well as form MA 5-94 should be issued to all summer sponsors.

4. Program Funding. The VEPS slots for the summer portion of the program must be reserved from the NYC summer slots which have already been allocated. VEPS slots for the in-school phase must be funded from the NYC FY '73 in-school allocation or from FY '72 carry forward funds. No separate funds will

be provided for the VEPS program. The Office of Education will not be involved in the 1972-73 VEPS program; therefore, RMAs must arrange to provide funds for the VEPS program team which will work exclusively with VEPS enrollees (See guidelines).

5. Inquiries. Any questions concerning this Field Memorandum or requests for technical assistance should be directed to the Chief, Division of Work Experience Programs at (202) 961-2803.

6. Expiration Date. June 30, 1973.

HAROLD O. BUZZELL
Deputy Manpower Administrator

Attachment

1972-73 Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector Guidelines

Purpose and Objectives

Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) is a pilot Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) Summer and In-School program in which NYC enrollees are provided on a year-round basis with work experience at private sector work-sites as well as an intensified orientation session, career exploration sessions, counseling, and remediation if needed. VEPS is not an additional program to NYC, but provides the NYC project director with the alternative of placing his NYC enrollees in private sector worksites rather than confining placement to the public sector.

The objectives of VEPS are: to reduce the high school drop-out rate, to provide disadvantaged students with skills enabling them upon graduation from high school to move on to further education or a job in the private sector, and to help disadvantaged students experience achievement and learn the value of education and training as preparation for the world of work.

Administrative Structure and Staff

1. The NYC project will have administrative and program responsibility for the VEPS program.
2. NYC will establish a program team to work exclusively with the VEPS program.
3. It is suggested that the VEPS program team be composed of a counselor, a vocational specialist, and a job developer-counselor. This staff should generally be adequate for 80-100 youth, with the program team/enrollee ratio being approximately 1:30. A counselor-job developer and a vocational specialist would be adequate for 50-70 youth. One member should be designated as project coordinator.
4. Where NYC is not sponsored by the school system, the NYC project director will assist the program team in gaining access to school system personnel and records in order to identify eligible youth (See Selection of Youth).

Selection of Youth

1. VEPS is a summer/in-school program, therefore, enrollees who begin the VEPS program in the summer must be enrolled in the 1972-73 in-school program so they may continue in VEPS during the school year.
2. Utilizing NYC enrollees who are presently in the in-school program or who have been recruited for the summer program, the program team will develop a list of youth who are at least 16 years of age.

3. Through consultation with the school officials, the program team should determine which enrollees on the list are probable dropouts according to such criterion as academic achievement, attendance records, disciplinary action, evidence of indifference, and reading difficulty.
4. Of these enrollees, the program team should determine those who are interested and rank them, placing those with the greatest school problems at the top of the list. This step will necessarily be subjective and some flexibility should be encouraged to reflect special family or personal problems.
5. Enrollees who participated in the 1971-72 VEPS program may be reenrolled in the 1972-73 program if the program team determines that reenrollment would be beneficial for the individual student. If a youth is reenrolled in VEPS, he may not be placed with any of his previous VEPS employers. New VEPS enrollees, however, will only be allowed to participate for a one year period. Therefore, prior to selection of VEPS enrollees, the program team should make clear to eligible youth that VEPS is only a one year program.
6. After the youth are ranked, selection should be made, taking those students at the top of the list first and moving down the list.
7. When sufficient youth have been selected to meet the program level, an additional fifteen enrollees should be identified as a reserve to replace any enrollees terminated from the program. These youth should receive the same counseling and orientation program as the other VEPS enrollees, but should be placed in regular NYC jobs until any original VEPS enrollees are terminated from the program.

Job Development

1. The program team will be responsible for job development. Cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB) is essential when approaching large employers. In addition, coordination with the local employment service office is encouraged to facilitate job development.
2. The program team will rely on NAB to provide local publicity, disseminate information on the program, and provide initial access to NAB employers. Additional help should be obtained from the Chamber of Commerce, professional groups, trade organizations, and local ES staff.
3. If employers express an interest in the program to NAB, the inquiries should be referred to the program team so that they can arrange for a full explanation of the program to the employer.
4. Job development for the program will concentrate on smaller employers (50 or fewer employees) who can:
 - a. provide two separate work experiences or job stations, one during the summer phase and the other during the in-school phase.
 - b. provide a wide variety of job activities, and

- c. guarantee the close supervision necessary for training.

Only secondary emphasis should be given to soliciting large blocks of job stations with large employers, although this source should not be ignored.

5. NYC will pay 100 percent of enrollee wages during a 60 hour orientation program and, thereafter, only 50 percent, with employers financing the other 50 percent of wages for all hours worked or spent in vocational exploration, counseling, and remediation sessions. Note: This 50-50 split of enrollee wages reflects the following factors:

- a. employers will have increased supervisory duties
 - b. enrollees will need to be trained in each job assignment
 - c. enrollees will have a greater incidence of problems than regular employees
 - d. enrollees will only be permitted to work part-time during the school year
 - e. enrollees will typically have lower rates of productivity than regular employees due to their part-time employment and lack of skill and experience
 - f. a continual 50-50 split will ease those administrative problems which might preclude smaller employers from participating.
6. A small number (5-10) of reserve work stations should be developed to be utilized in the event any employer withdraws from the program or is found to be unsuitable.

Pre-job Orientation

1. The program team will conduct "world-of-work" orientation and begin vocational exploration in the initial 60 hours of the program.
2. The sessions will generally be phased as follows:
 - a. Week One--World-of-Work Orientation and Vocational Exploration
 - b. Week Two--Continued Vocational Exploration and Determination of Job Interests and Skills
 - c. Week Three--Correlation of Interest and Skills with Available Jobs and Re-emphasis on Necessary Job Attitudes and Responsibilities

Counselors should have the flexibility to delay some referrals beyond the 60 hour orientation.

3. Job referrals will be conducted during the second and third week.

Responsibilities of Private Sector Employers

1. Identify private sector training and work experience positions for VEPS enrollees.

2. Provide two work experiences or job stations (one during the summer phase and one during the in-school phase), provide a wide variety of job activities, and guarantee close supervision necessary for training.
3. Provide their regular orientation given for all employees, including a company tour and a discussion of the interrelationships between various jobs in the company.
4. Designate personnel who will devote sufficient time to training and working with enrollees, in cooperation with the program team.
5. Companies must assure that participation of enrollees will not result in the displacement of employed workers or result in the substitution of these enrollees for regular workers who would normally be hired.
6. Agree to the terms of enrollee payment outlined in item 5 under Job Development.
7. Comply with the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and pertinent State or local laws regarding the training and employment of youth.
8. Execute a Letter of Agreement with the program team covering the above responsibilities and agree not to hire for full-time employment any enrollees entering this program until they have graduated from high school.
9. In the event that a VEPS occupation is covered by a bargaining agreement within the employer's establishment, the employer must indicate that he has discussed the program with the appropriate bargaining agency and has the concurrence of the agency as to the on-the-job training, and rates of pay associated therewith.

Responsibilities of VEPS Enrollees

When selected but prior to assignment to a private sector company, enrollees shall agree to the following:

1. Maintain at least a passing grade in school year courses.
2. Work to the best of their ability in school and on-the-job.
3. Abide by the basic procedures governing this program as established by the program team and the employer.
4. Consult their counselors on a regular basis as determined by the program team.

On-Going Counseling and Employer Contact

1. The counselor and/or job-developer counselor on the program team have the primary responsibility for on-going counseling and employer contact.
2. The counselor(s) augmented by the vocational specialist should be able to work effectively with the youth and their employers.

3. Contacts with the enrollees should be made at school, work and with their families at home or in group meetings. Parental support should be secured early in the program.
4. Contacts with the employers will be initiated to deal with such items as:
 - a. Enrollee Performance
 - b. Time Records and Payroll
 - c. Types of Job Assignments
 - d. Emerging Problems
5. Counselors will also need to determine whether responsibilities outlined in the section on Responsibilities of Private Sector Employers are carried out.
6. It should be expected that the counselors will have to deal with various crisis situations relating to the enrollee's job, academic work and family situations.
7. Counselors should attempt to alleviate severe transportation problems through job placement near school and home, assistance in using public or school transportation, arranging car pools, etc. Counselors should avoid creating situations in which the enrollee becomes dependent upon the staff for work transportation.
8. Counselors will determine whether enrollees should be transferred to other employers and if transfers are necessary whether employers will remain in the program.
9. If an enrollee terminates his employment, the counselors will attempt to replace the youth to avoid penalizing an employer for his efforts in working with the program.

On-going Vocational Exploration

1. The vocational specialist's primary responsibility will be to implement a special, on-going program of career exploration which is independent of the regular school curriculum.
2. Generally, this program will be conducted in NYC facilities or the schools as local conditions dictate, although employers of several youth may provide their own facilities.
3. The exploration program may utilize a variety of techniques but should include field trips and outside speakers. Small group sessions with maximum youth participation have been effective in the past.
4. The vocational specialist will also devote his efforts toward:
 - a. arranging school schedules to allow for work
 - b. matching school subjects and job assignment to enrollee's interest

c. attempting to arrange academic credit for the work experience obtained through the program.

5. If needed, remediation should be provided to VEPS enrollees.

6. A bi-weekly session of at least four hours for counseling, remediation and vocational exploration is required. (Note: The employers will be required to pay 50 percent of the enrollees' wages for these sessions).

Implementation Assistance

1. A "Model for Implementing the Revised Guidelines for VEPS" is being developed and will be distributed subsequently. The model will contain, among other items, suggested materials for orientation and career exploration sessions.

2. Inquiries concerning VEPS should be directed to the appropriate regional office.

Timing of Program Elements

While the following timing has some flexibility, it is recommended that program implementation follow the schedule as closely as practicable.

May

1. Hire or identify program team
2. NAB publicity and meetings
3. Select youth
4. Begin job development
5. Program team develops internal administrative arrangements
6. Program team develops curriculum for orientation sessions

June First week

7. Orientation curriculum finalized

Second week

8. Job development finished

Third week

9. Youth begin orientation

Fourth week

10. Orientation continues and referrals begin

11. Referrals of enrollees completed and orientation ends

July and August

12. Full time training and work experience for enrollees

13. On-going career exploration begins

14. On-going counseling and employer contact

September - June

15. 15 hour per week in-school segment of work experience and training

16. Career exploration continues

17. Counseling and employer contact continues

Cost Breakdown Per Enrollee

	Hours	NYC Share of Wage	Per enrollee DOL cost
Orientation	60	\$1.60 (100%)	\$ 96.00
Full-time summer phase	400	.80 (50%)	320.00
Full-time in-school phase	585	.80 (50%)	<u>468.00</u>
			\$884.00

It is recommended that: the 60 hour orientation period be spread over a three week period (15 days) at 4 hours per day, the full-time summer phase be spread over a ten week period (50 days) at 8 hours per day and the full-time in-school phase be spread over a thirty-nine week period (195 days) at 3 hours per day. No allowance will be made for business holidays. Enrollees could work more hours during their school vacations.

Reporting Requirements

Form MA 5-94, with accompanying instructions, is being issued to all NYC. summer sponsors. The number of VEPS enrollees who participate one or more months must be listed by work assignment in line A.1 of form MA 5-94. This form must be submitted at the conclusion of the summer program attached to the final Form BWTP-9 and Form MA 5-6A.

APPENDIX C

In reply refer
to MDTW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Manpower Administration
Washington, D. C. 20010

August 24, 1973

FIELD MEMORANDUM NO. 255-73

TO: ALL ASSISTANT REGIONAL DIRECTORS FOR MANPOWER

SUBJECT: NYC Enrollee Placement in the Private Sector

REFERENCES: FM's 183-71 and 195-72; MAO 8-73

1. Purpose. To provide guidelines for placing Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) In-School, Summer, and Out-of-School enrollees at private-for-profit worksites.

2. Background. In June 1971, the Manpower Administration implemented a pilot program, Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS), in which NYC In-School and Summer enrollees were rotated through worksite assignments in the private sector. This pilot program has operated in approximately 23 cities with mixed success. Two of the cities were granted permission to implement the program in the Out-of-School component.

Manpower Administration Order 8-73 indicates that placement of enrollees at private-for-profit worksites will be allowed pending new guidelines to be issued within 60 days. These new guidelines (see attached) allow more flexibility to regions and sponsors than did the previous VEPS guidelines (FMs 183-71 and 195-72). However, regional offices may retain the VEPS guidelines in part or in their entirety, or may use them as a model.

3. Action Required. The Code of Federal Regulations must be amended prior to implementation of the new guidelines. It is expected that this will be accomplished in about 6 weeks. As soon as this process is completed, ARDM's will be notified that they may execute contract modifications to allow for placement of NYC enrollees at private-for-profit worksites in accordance with the attached guidelines, if it is determined that such modifications will make new or existing programs or projects more effective.

4. Implementation Assistance. The Center for Urban Programs at St. Louis University has been under contract with the Department since 1971 for the purpose of monitoring/analyzing the VEPS program. Based on their experience with VEPS, they will be developing a model with ideas for implementing a program to effectively place enrollees at private-for-profit worksites. It is expected that this model will be available early this fall.

5. Inquires. Any questions concerning this Field Memo may be directed to Ms. Wendy Lipton at (202) 961-3766.

6. Expiration Date. Continuing.

PIERCE QUINLAN
Director
Office of Field Coordination

Attachment

GUIDELINES

Enrollees may be placed at a private-for-profit worksite for up to 1000 hours of work experience provided that the following guides are adhered to:

1. After 500 hours at the worksite, the enrollee will be rotated to a new work/training experience. For example, if an enrollee is placed at a dry cleaning store, the enrollee might spend the first 500 hours receiving training/work experience as a cashier, and the second 500 hours receiving training/work experience as a machine operator.

An enrollee may not be trained in any field in which after a short demonstration, the enrollee would be productive. To determine occupations of this sort, you should refer to the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Any occupation whose Specific Vocational Preparation time is listed at level 1 would be inappropriate for NYC enrollees.

2. The wages which the enrollee receives will be shared on a 50/50 basis between the employer and the NYC sponsor. The sharing may be for time spent in work experience only, or if the employer agrees, for the total enrollee participation time in the project, including orientation, career counseling, remedial education, etc.

3. After the 1000 hours with one employer is completed, the enrollee can either (a) be picked up by the employer entirely on his payroll (hence terminated from the program), or (b) be placed with another employer for new training.

4. Companies with whom enrollees are placed must assure that participation of enrollees will not result in the displacement of employed workers or result in the substitution of these enrollees for regular workers who would normally be hired.

5. Companies must comply with the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and pertinent State or local laws regarding the training and employment of youth.

6. In the event that an occupation in which an NYC enrollee is being trained is covered by a bargaining agreement with a company's establishment, the company must indicate that it has discussed the program with the appropriate bargaining agency and has the concurrence of the agency as to the on-the-job training, and rates of pay associated therewith.

The following recommended practices should, if possible, be incorporated:

1. Pre-placement orientation should be provided by the sponsor. Areas covered might include world of work orientation (job attitudes, dress, responsibilities), career exploration sessions, determination of job interests and skills, and correlation of interest and skills with available jobs.
2. Career counseling and exploration activities are encouraged and should be provided by the sponsor and the employer on an on-going basis. Exploration activities might include field trips and outside speakers.
3. To avoid duplication of effort, sponsors should be encouraged to coordinate their worksite development activities with the National Alliance of Businessmen.
4. In-School and Summer NYC sponsors should also be encouraged to establish a linkage with the school's vocational or work experience division to assist in the development of a career counseling/exploration curriculum, etc. An effort should be made to enroll youth into the private sector NYC program who would not ordinarily be eligible for the school's regular vocational or work experience program.
5. Companies should be encouraged to:
 - a. Identify private sector training and work experience positions for NYC enrollees.
 - b. Provide two work experience/training positions (or job stations), a wide variety of job activities, and guarantee close supervision necessary for training.
 - c. Provide their regular orientation given for all employees, including a company tour and a discussion of the interrelationships between various jobs in the company.
 - d. Designate personnel who will devote sufficient time to training and working with enrollees.
 - e. Agree to the terms of enrollee payment as stipulated in Item 2.
 - f. Agree not to hire any In-School or Summer NYC enrollees for full-time employment until they have graduated from high school (this does not apply to Out-of-School enrollees).
 - g. Execute a Letter of Agreement with the NYC sponsor covering the above responsibilities.

TABLE D-1

SELECTED FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS, BY CITY AND TOTAL*

Family Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC.	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
LIVES WITH (N)	(98)	(0)	(1)	(66)	(38)	(24)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(125)	(606)	(427)
Both Parents	24.5%	--%	--%	19.7%	36.8%	58.3%	19.0%	31.4%	41.5%	46.7%	48.0%	37.1%	36.2%
Father	7.1	--	--	--	5.3	--	--	1.4	4.9	0.8	4.0	3.0	0.9
Mother	60.2	--	100.0	72.7	52.6	12.5	71.4	55.7	39.0	40.2	40.8	49.7	54.5
Guardian	3.1	--	--	3.0	5.3	12.5	9.5	10.0	2.4	7.4	2.4	5.3	3.5
Other	5.1	--	--	4.5	--	16.7	--	1.4	12.2	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
HEAD OF HOUSE-													
HOLD (N)	(98)	(0)	(15)	(66)	(38)	(24)	(21)	(70)	(41)	(122)	(125)	(620)	(429)
Father	31.6%	--%	26.7%	19.7%	42.1%	58.3%	19.0%	32.9%	46.3%	47.5%	52.0%	39.8%	36.4%
Mother	60.2	--	53.3	72.7	52.6	12.5	71.4	55.7	39.0	40.2	40.8	49.7	55.4
Other	8.1	--	20.0	7.5	5.3	29.2	9.6	11.4	14.6	12.3	7.2	10.6	8.2
EMPLOYMENT OF													
HEAD (N)	(86)	(0)	(15)	(65)	(3)	(24)	(21)	(70)	(40)	(104)	(125)	(553)	(409)
Full-time	22.1%	--%	40.0%	9.2%	33.3%	45.8%	33.3%	18.6%	22.5%	43.3%	32.8%	28.6%	31.1%
35 hrs. or less	15.1	--	20.0	4.6	33.3	29.2	14.3	20.0	--	8.7	25.6	15.4	14.9
Unemployed	62.8	--	40.0	86.2	33.3	25.0	52.4	61.4	77.5	48.1	41.6	56.0	54.0
CONTRIBUTES TO FAMILY													
SUPPORT (N)	(89)	(0)	(15)	(60)	(2)	(19)	(19)	(69)	(41)	(97)	(125)	(536)	(370)
Yes	71.9%	--%	60.0%	--%	100.0%	36.8%	63.2%	15.9%	70.7%	33.0%	69.6%	47.2%	30.8%
No	28.1	--	40.0	100.0	--	63.2	36.8	84.1	29.3	67.0	30.4	52.8	69.2
PUBLIC HOUSING (N)	(80)	(0)	(0)	(65)	(34)	(24)	(18)	(70)	(40)	(92)	(111)	(534)	(404)
Yes	21.3%	--%	--%	16.9%	17.6%	--%	22.2%	40.0%	15.0%	13.0%	8.1%	17.4%	21.8%
No	78.7	--	--	83.1	82.4	100.0%	77.8	60.0	85.0	87.0	91.9	82.6	78.2
PUBLIC ASSIS-													
TANCE (N)	(92)	(34)	(36)	(65)	(51)	(23)	(20)	(69)	(39)	(118)	(115)	(662)	(422)
Yes	77.2%	11.8%	11.1%	83.1%	31.4%	4.3%	60.0%	49.3%	66.7%	28.8%	53.0%	47.9%	47.9%
No	22.8	88.2	88.9	16.9	68.6	95.7	40.0	50.7	33.3	71.2	47.0	52.1	52.1

*Comparable to VEPS-I, 98.5% of the enrollees were single. Two youth were married in Cleveland, Fort Worth and Pueblo; one each in Georgetown, Salt Lake City and San Bernardino.

TABLE D-2

SELECTED EMPLOYMENT HISTORY CHARACTERISTICS
OF VEPS ENRÔLLEES, BY CITY

Employment History		Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	SanB.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>EVER WORKED</u>	(N)	(89)	(0)	(27)	(65)	(63)	(24)	(20)	(70)	(41)	(98)	(125)	(622)	(405)
Yes		97.8%	--%	55.6%	53.8%	52.4%	83.3%	60.0%	68.6%	95.1%	61.2%	92.0%	74.6%	58.3%
No		2.2	--	44.4	46.2	47.6	16.7	40.0	31.4	4.9	38.8	8.0	25.4	41.7
<u>PRESENTLY WORK-</u>														
<u>ING</u>	(N)	(88)	(0)	(15)	(65)	(34)	(24)	(18)	(70)	(41)	(94)	(112)	(561)	(402)
Yes		36.4%	--%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	4.3%	2.4%	6.4%	1.8%	9.3%	12.4%
No		63.6	--	100.0	92.3	100.0	87.5	100.0	95.7	97.6	93.6	98.2	90.7	87.6
<u>WORKED 30 DAYS</u>														
<u>OR MORE</u>	(N)	(89)	(0)	(25)	(65)	(32)	(22)	(20)	(70)	(41)	(94)	(125)	(583)	(397)
Yes		91.1%	--%	52.0%	47.7%	6.3%	68.2%	60.0%	61.4%	90.2%	47.9%	87.2%	66.5%	51.1%
No		8.9	--	48.0	52.3	93.7	31.8	40.0	38.6	9.8	52.1	12.8	33.6	48.9

TABLE D-3

MEAN SCHOOL DAYS ABSENT FOR 1971-72
AND 1972-73, BY CITY

City	X Days Absent (1971-72)				X Days Absent (1972-73)	
	Universe	(N)	Completers	(N)	VEPS Completers	Absence Change*
Cleveland	027	(94)	023	(76)	024	-001
Colorado Springs	008	(34)	007	(14)	010	-003
Flint	028	(66)	027	(29)	031	-004
Fort Worth	024	(59)	022	(36)	015	+007
Georgetown	018	(14)	005	(3)	004	+001
Las Vegas	018	(18)	018	(2)	020	-002
Pittsburgh	035	(60)	035	(51)	032	+003
Pueblo	018	(28)	019	(8)	012	+007
Salt Lake City	024	(93)	016	(29)	014	+002
San Bernardino	011	(69)	009	(39)	010	-001

*+ = improvement or fewer days absent; - = decline or more days absent

TABLE D-4

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS
COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Demographic Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
SEX (N)	(78)	(14)	(20)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(386)	(272)
Male	65.4%	50.0%	60.0%	51.7%	56.1%	28.6%	15.4%	53.8%	87.5%	44.4%	43.5%	53.1%	51.8%
Female	34.6	50.0	40.0	48.3	43.9	71.4	84.6	46.2	12.5	55.6	56.5	46.9	48.2
AGE (N)	(78)	(14)	(20)	(29)	(38)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(383)	(257)
15 or Younger	10.3%	21.4%	20.0%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	6.3%	11.1%	37.1%	13.3%	12.1%
16 Years	37.2	50.0	35.0	37.9	34.2	42.9	46.2	17.3	25.0	38.9	56.5	37.8	50.2
17 Years	30.8	28.6	45.0	44.8	57.9	28.6	38.5	50.0	56.3	46.3	4.8	37.1	28.0
18 or Older	21.8	0.0	0.0	6.9	7.9	28.6	15.4	26.9	12.5	3.7	1.6	11.8	9.8
ETHNIC BACKGROUND (N)	(78)	(14)	(20)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(386)	(272)
Black	75.6%	21.4%	0.0%	82.8%	80.5%	28.6%	53.8%	92.3%	0.0%	5.6%	25.8%	50.5%	52.9%
White	14.1	35.7	100.0	10.3	4.9	57.1	46.2	7.7	0.0	75.9	37.1	30.8	28.3
Spanish Surname	10.3	42.9	0.0	6.9	14.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	14.8	37.1	18.1	18.4
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.5	0.4
YEAR IN SCHOOL (N)	(78)	(14)	(20)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(386)	(269)
Freshman	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%
Sophomore	20.5	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.5	0.0	5.6	11.3	9.1	4.1
Junior	26.9	50.0	25.0	37.9	26.8	42.9	7.7	21.2	25.0	46.3	67.7	36.5	68.4
Senior	47.4	50.0	65.0	62.1	73.2	42.9	92.3	65.4	75.0	48.1	19.4	52.8	26.4

TABLE D-5

SELECTED FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Family Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Ft.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
HEAD OF HOUSE-													
<u>HOLD</u>	(N)	(78)	(NA)	(7)	(29)	(32)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(350)
Father		33.3%	--%	42.9%	20.7%	46.9%	42.9%	30.8%	38.5%	37.5%	48.1%	61.3%	42.0%
Mother		60.3	--	42.9	72.4	46.9	14.3	61.5	50.0	56.3	40.7	33.9	49.4
Male Guardian		1.3	--	14.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	2.6
Female Guardian		2.6	--	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Self		0.0	--	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other		2.6	--	0.0	6.9	0.0	42.9	0.0	1.9	6.3	3.7	4.8	4.0
EMPLOYMENT OF													
<u>HEAD</u>	(N)	(71)	(NA)	(7)	(29)	(2)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(44)	(62)	(303)
Over 35 hrs.		25.4%	--%	28.6%	3.4%	50.0%	28.6%	23.1%	19.2%	18.8%	40.9%	33.9%	26.1%
35 hrs or Less		15.5	--	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	7.7	23.1	0.0	9.1	27.4	16.2
Unemployed		59.2	--	57.1	96.6	50.0	28.6	69.2	57.7	81.3	50.0	38.7	57.7
CONTRIBUTES TO													
<u>FAMILY</u>	(N)	(75)	(NA)	(7)	(28)	(2)	(4)	(12)	(51)	(16)	(42)	(62)	(299)
Yes		80.0%	--%	57.1%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	17.6%	93.8%	21.4%	80.6%	53.2%
No		20.0	--	42.9	100.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	82.4	6.3	78.6	19.4	46.8
PUBLIC HOUSING													
<u>Yes</u>	(N)	(61)	(NA)	(NA)	(29)	(29)	(7)	(11)	(52)	(16)	(40)	(52)	(297)
Yes		19.7%	--%	0.0%	10.3%	20.7%	0.0%	27.3%	38.5%	12.5%	12.5%	13.5%	19.5%
No		80.3	--	--	89.7	79.3	100.0	72.7	61.5	87.5	87.5	86.5	80.5
PUBLIC ASSIS-													
<u>TANCE</u>	(N)	(73)	(11)	(17)	(28)	(34)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(53)	(55)	(359)
Yes		76.7%	9.1%	17.6%	89.3%	23.5%	0.0%	61.5%	51.9%	75.0%	30.2%	50.9%	51.2%
No		23.3	90.9	82.4	10.7	76.5	100.0	38.5	48.1	25.0	69.8	49.1	48.7

TABLE D-6

SELECTED EMPLOYMENT HISTORY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS
COMPLETERS, BY CITY

Employment History		Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>EVER WORKED</u>	(N)	(75)	(NA)	(11)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(44)	(62)	(350)	(253)
Yes		98.7%	--%	72.7%	51.7%	51.2%	71.4%	69.2%	63.5%	93.8%	56.8%	90.3%	74.6%	61.7%
No		1.3	--	27.3	48.3	48.8	28.6	30.8	36.5	6.3	43.2	9.7	25.4	38.3
<u>PRESENTLY WORK-</u>														
<u>ING</u>	(N)	(74)	(NA)	(4)	(29)	(23)	(7)	(11)	(52)	(16)	(41)	(56)	(313)	(251)
Yes		37.8%	--%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	4.9%	1.8%	12.1%	13.1%
No		60.8	--	25.0	34.5	13.0	57.1	63.6	61.5	93.8	48.8	87.5	59.4	48.2
Never Worked		1.4	--	75.0	48.3	87.0	28.6	36.4	36.5	6.3	46.3	10.7	28.4	38.6
<u>WORKED 30 DAYS</u>	(N)	(75)	(NA)	(10)	(29)	(21)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(42)	(62)	(327)	(248)
Yes		93.3%	--%	70.0%	48.3%	4.8%	42.9%	69.2%	55.8%	93.8%	35.7%	85.5	66.0%	53.6%
No		5.3	--	0.0	3.4	0.0	28.6	0.0	7.7	0.0	19.0	4.8	6.7	7.3
Never Worked		1.3	--	30.0	48.3	95.2	28.6	30.8	36.5	6.3	45.2	9.7	27.2	39.1

*Data from Colorado Springs not available.

TABLE D-7

CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS WORK EXPERIENCE OF COMPLETERS, BY CITY

VEPS Work Experience	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
SIZE OF EMPLOYER (N)	(78)	(14)	(18)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(384)	(261)
1-4	23.1%	78.6%	38.9%	6.9%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	11.5%	31.3%	44.4%	12.9%	21.3%	22.2%
5-9	16.7	0.0	27.8	27.6	36.6	28.6	0.0	7.7	31.3	14.8	17.7	18.5	28.0
10-19	10.3	14.3	16.7	44.8	26.8	14.3	0.0	28.8	12.5	22.2	32.3	22.7	13.8
20-29	15.4	7.1	0.0	13.8	24.4	14.3	0.0	21.2	6.3	5.6	9.7	12.8	6.5
30-49	9.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	7.7	6.3	9.3	12.9	7.5	7.7
50-99	2.6	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	13.5	6.3	3.7	4.8	4.9	10.7
100 or More	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	100.0	9.6	6.3	0.0	9.7	12.2	11.1
WORK EXPERIENCE (N)	(78)	(14)	(18)	(29)	(41)	(7)	(13)	(52)	(16)	(54)	(62)	(384)	(261)
Professional	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	14.3%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	2.3%
Manager	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Sales	17.9	7.1	5.6	10.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	19.2	0.0	14.8	16.1	12.5	17.6
Clerical	23.1	28.6	27.8	27.6	19.5	42.9	92.3	19.2	12.5	38.9	37.1	29.7	34.5
Craftman	2.6	7.1	11.1	0.0	24.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	4.8	5.2	4.2
Operative	11.5	7.1	27.8	13.8	22.0	14.3	0.0	28.8	62.5	13.0	22.6	19.5	14.2
Laborer	16.7	14.3	11.1	13.8	12.2	0.0	0.0	17.3	25.0	14.8	6.5	13.3	16.1
Service	28.2	3.7	16.7	34.5	14.6	28.6	0.0	15.4	0.0	14.8	12.9	18.7	10.7

TABLE D-8

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS
TERMINATORS BY CITY

Demographic Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>SEX</u> (N)	(21)	(27)	(22)	(38)	(22)	(18)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(63)	(330)	(159)
Male	71.4%	40.7%	72.7%	50.0%	45.5%	72.2%	0.0%	72.2%	52.0%	47.1%	41.3%	50.9%	53.5%
Female	28.6	59.3	27.3	50.0	54.5	27.8	100.0	27.8	48.0	52.9	58.7	49.1	46.5
<u>AGE</u> (N)	(21)	(26)	(22)	(38)	(21)	(16)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(63)	(326)	(151)
15 or Younger	9.5%	7.7%	50.0%	5.3%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%	5.6%	8.0%	11.8%	41.3%	17.8%	12.6%
16 Years	47.6	42.3	13.6	31.6	23.8	37.5	37.5	33.3	36.0	48.5	41.3	38.0	58.9
17 Years	33.3	42.3	36.4	44.7	52.4	31.3	50.0	33.3	44.0	26.5	15.9	33.1	25.8
18 or Older	9.5	7.7	0.0	18.4	9.5	25.0	12.5	27.8	12.0	13.2	1.6	11.0	2.7
<u>ETHNIC BACK-</u>													
<u>GROUND</u> (N)	(21)	(26)	(22)	(38)	(22)	(18)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(63)	(329)	(159)
Black	76.2%	11.5%	0.0%	84.2%	72.7%	72.2%	87.5%	94.4%	4.0%	14.7%	19.0%	38.6%	40.3%
White	19.0	42.3	95.5	7.9	9.1	16.7	12.5	5.6	4.0	64.7	44.4	36.2	40.9
Spanish Surnames	4.8	46.2	4.5	5.3	18.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	92.0	16.2	36.5	24.0	17.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	1.2	1.9
<u>YEAR IN SCHOOL</u> (N)	(21)	(25)	(22)	(37)	(22)	(17)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(61)	(324)	(155)
Freshman	9.5%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	2.6%
Sophomore	33.3	8.0	36.4	0.0	4.5	23.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	16.4	10.5	11.6
Junior	38.1	24.0	18.2	43.2	18.2	58.8	0.0	27.8	32.0	58.8	68.9	44.1	65.2
Senior	19.0	64.0	45.5	56.8	77.3	17.6	100.0	50.0	68.0	41.2	14.8	43.8	20.6

TABLE D-9

SELECTED FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS TERMINATORS, BY CITY

Family Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
HEAD OF HOUSE-													
<u>HOLD</u> (N) (20) (NA)			(8)	(37)	(6)	(17)	(8)	(18)	(25)	(68)	(63)	(270)	(159)
Father	25.0%	--%	12.5%	18.9%	16.7%	64.7%	0.0%	16.7%	52.0%	47.1%	42.9%	37.0%	36.3%
Mother	60.0	--	62.5	73.0	83.3	11.8	87.5	72.2	28.0	39.7	47.6	50.0	54.8
Other Male	0.0	--	12.5	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	5.6	4.0	2.9	0.0	2.6	3.2
Other Female	0.0	--	12.5	5.4	0.0	5.9	12.5	5.6	0.0	4.4	4.8	4.4	2.5
Self	5.0	--	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	1.5	0.0	1.1	2.5
Other	10.0	--	0.0	2.7	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	12.0	4.4	4.8	4.8	0.6
EMPLOYMENT OF													
<u>HEAD</u> (N) (15) (NA)			(8)	(36)	(1)	(17)	(8)	(18)	(24)	(60)	(63)	(250)	(155)
Over 35 hrs.	6.7%	--%	50.0%	13.9%	0.0%	52.9%	50.0%	16.7%	25.0%	45.0%	31.7%	31.6%	31.0%
35 hrs. or less	13.3	--	25.0	8.3	100.0	23.5	25.0	11.1	0.0	8.3	23.8	14.4	12.4
Unemployed	80.0	--	25.0	77.8	0.0	23.5	25.0	72.2	75.0	46.7	44.4	54.0	56.6
CONTRIBUTES TO FAM- ILY SUPPORT													
(N) (14) (NA)			(8)	(32)	(NA)	(15)	(7)	(18)	(25)	(55)	(63)	(237)	(152)
Yes	28.6%	--%	62.5%	0.0%	--%	33.3%	57.1%	11.1%	56.0%	41.8%	58.7%	39.7%	34.7%
No	71.4	--	37.5	100.0	--	66.7	42.9	88.9	44.0	58.2	41.3	60.3	65.3
PUBLIC HOUSING													
(N) (19) (NA)			(NA)	(36)	(5)	(17)	(7)	(18)	(24)	(52)	(59)	(237)	(152)
Yes	26.3%	--%	--%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	44.4%	16.7%	13.5%	3.4%	14.8%	22.6%
No	73.7	--	--	77.8	100.0	100.0	85.7	55.6	83.3	86.5	96.6	85.2	77.4
PUBLIC ASSIS- TANCE													
(N) (19) (23)			(19)	(37)	(17)	(16)	(7)	(17)	(23)	(65)	(60)	(303)	(152)
Yes	78.9%	13.0%	5.3%	78.4%	47.1%	6.3%	57.1%	41.2%	60.9%	27.7%	55.0%	43.9%	44.4%
No	21.1	87.0	94.7	21.6	52.9	93.8	42.9	58.8	39.1	72.3	45.0	56.1	55.6

TABLE D-10

SELECTED EMPLOYMENT HISTORY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS TERMINATORS, BY CITY

Employment History	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>EVER WORKED</u>	(N)	(14)	(NA)	(16)	(36)	(17)	(7)	(18)	(25)	(54)	(63)	(272)	(150)
Yes	92.9%	--%	43.8%	55.6%	54.5%	88.2%	42.9%	83.3%	96.0%	64.8%	93.7%	74.6%	52.7%
No	7.1	--	56.3	44.4	45.5	11.8	57.1	16.7	4.0	35.2	6.3	25.4	47.3
<u>PRESENTLY WORKING</u>	(N)	(14)	(NA)	(11)	(36)	(11)	(7)	(18)	(25)	(53)	(56)	(248)	(149)
Yes	28.6%	--%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	11.1%	4.0%	7.5%	1.8%	5.6%	11.4%
No	64.3	--	18.2	55.6	9.1	76.5	42.9	72.2	92.0	56.6	91.1	66.5	40.9
Never Worked	7.1	--	81.8	44.4	90.9	11.8	57.1	16.7	4.0	35.8	7.1	27.8	47.7
<u>WORKED 30 DAYS</u>	(N)	(14)	(NA)	(15)	(36)	(11)	(15)	(7)	(18)	(25)	(52)	(256)	(147)
Yes	78.6%	--%	40.0%	47.2%	9.1%	80.0%	42.9%	77.8%	88.0%	57.7%	88.9%	67.2%	46.9%
No	14.3	--	0.0	8.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	5.6	8.0	5.8	4.8	5.9	4.8
Never Worked	7.1	--	60.0	44.4	90.9	13.3	57.1	16.7	4.0	36.5	6.3	26.9	48.3

TABLE D-11

CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS WORK EXPERIENCE OF TERMINATORS, BY CITY

VEPS. Work Experience	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
SIZE OF													
EMPLOYER (N)	(18)	(27)	(21)	(32)	(20)	(18)	(8)	(17)	(20)	(68)	(58)	(307)	(132)
1-4	38.9%	33.3%	28.6%	3.1%	5.0%	33.3%	0.0%	23.5%	55.0%	41.2%	15.5%	26.7%	24.2%
5-9	5.6	18.5	47.6	40.6	40.0	27.8	0.0	11.8	30.0	16.2	24.1	24.4	24.2
10-19	16.7	37.0	19.0	34.4	30.0	5.6	0.0	29.4	0.0	11.8	32.8	21.8	16.7
20-29	16.7	3.7	0.0	18.8	5.0	5.6	0.0	17.6	0.0	4.4	17.2	9.1	6.1
30-49	11.1	0.0	4.8	0.0	5.0	16.7	0.0	5.9	5.0	17.6	5.2	7.8	6.1
50-99	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	5.9	10.0	4.4	0.0	2.9	13.6
100 or More	5.6	7.4	0.0	3.1	15.0	0.0	100.0	5.9	0.0	4.4	5.2	7.2	9.1
WORK EXPERI-													
ENCE (N)	(18)	(27)	(21)	(32)	(20)	(18)	(8)	(17)	(20)	(68)	(58)	(307)	(129)
Professional	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	0.0%
Manager	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Sales	0.0	7.4	9.5	6.2	10.0	16.7	0.0	17.6	10.0	7.4	13.8	9.4	12.4
Clerical	22.2	48.1	0.0	18.7	40.0	16.7	100.0	5.9	15.0	19.1	32.7	25.4	34.1
Craftsman	5.6	3.7	4.8	3.1	15.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	15.0	11.8	6.9	8.1	2.3
Operative	16.6	7.4	23.8	6.2	15.0	5.6	0.0	29.4	25.0	33.8	12.1	18.2	25.6
Laborer	11.1	25.9	33.3	18.7	10.0	11.1	0.0	5.9	10.0	13.2	12.1	14.7	14.7
Service	44.4	7.4	28.6	46.9	10.0	27.8	0.0	41.2	25.0	14.7	19.0	23.1	10.1

TABLE D-12

ACADEMIC INDICATORS OF VEPS TERMINATORS, BY CITY

	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
<u>DIRECTION OF</u>													
<u>G.P.A. CHANGE</u> (N)	(7)	(20)	(NA)	(32)	(11)	(10)	(6)	(9)	(12)	(49)	(39)	(195)	(65)
Up	14.3%	35.0%	--%	53.1%	27.3%	80.0%	33.3%	55.6%	50.0%	67.3%	43.6%	50.8%	53.8%
Same	57.1	5.0	--	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	6.1	2.6	6.7	3.1
Down	28.6	60.0	--	46.9	63.6	20.0	66.7	33.3	33.3	26.5	53.8	42.6	43.1
<u>SCALE G.P.A.</u>													
<u>CHANGE</u> (N)	(7)	(20)	(NA)	(32)	(11)	(10)	(6)	(9)	(12)	(49)	(39)	(195)	(65)
+1.26 or Better	0.0%	0.0%	--%	9.4%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	7.7%
+0.76 to +1.25	0.0	20.0	--	12.5	27.3	10.0	16.7	11.1	16.7	18.4	10.3	14.9	10.8
+0.26 to +0.75	14.3	5.0	--	15.6	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	16.7	32.7	23.1	19.5	26.2
+0.25 to -0.25	71.4	40.0	--	31.3	9.1	70.0	50.0	22.2	50.0	30.6	25.6	34.4	23.1
-0.26 to -0.75	0.0	20.0	--	15.6	9.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	8.3	12.2	30.8	16.4	17.0
-0.76 to -1.25	0.0	15.0	--	6.3	18.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	6.1	10.3	8.2	9.2
-1.26 or Worse	14.3	0.0	--	9.4	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	6.2
<u>DIRECTION OF ATTEND-</u>													
<u>ANCE CHANGE</u> (N)	(7)	(19)	(NA)	(31)	(11)	(6)	(5)	(9)	(7)	(25)	(27)	(147)	(61)
Up	14.3%	21.1%	--%	35.5%	81.8%	83.3%	40.0%	33.3%	57.1%	68.0%	44.4%	46.2%	45.9%
Same	0.0	15.8	--	9.7	9.1	16.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	8.0	18.5	10.9	3.3
Down	85.7	63.2	--	54.8	9.1	0.0	60.0	66.7	28.6	24.0	37.0	42.8	50.8
<u>SCALE OF ATTEND-</u>													
<u>ANCE CHANGE</u> (N)	(7)	(19)	(NA)	(31)	(11)	(6)	(5)	(9)	(7)	(25)	(27)	(147)	(61)
+10 Days or More	14.3%	10.5%	--%	22.6%	18.2%	33.3%	0.0%	11.1%	28.6%	36.0%	11.1%	19.7%	18.0%
+4 to +9	0.0	10.5	--	9.7	27.3	16.7	0.0	22.2	14.3	12.0	18.5	13.6	19.7
+3 to -3	28.6	36.8	--	22.6	45.5	50.0	60.0	11.1	28.6	32.0	48.1	34.7	18.0
-4 to -9	14.3	36.8	--	12.9	9.1	0.0	20.0	11.1	0.0	8.0	11.1	13.6	19.7
-10 or More	42.9	5.3	--	32.3	0.0	0.0	20.0	44.4	28.6	12.0	11.1	18.4	24.6

TABLE D-13

REASONS GIVEN FOR TERMINATION OF VEPS ENROLLEES, BY SIZE
OF VEPS EMPLOYER (NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES)

Reason for Termination	SIZE OF EMPLOYER							VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
	1-4	5-9	10-19	20-29	30-49	50-99	100 plus		
Other Private Sector Job	14.7%	26.5%	23.5%	8.8%	11.8%	0.0%	14.7%	11.5%	17.8%
Involuntary Transfer to NYC	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	9.3
Pregnancy	20.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	1.7	4.7
Not Interested	27.3	27.3	18.2	4.5	9.1	0.0	13.6	7.5	5.4
Moved	23.1	7.7	30.8	15.4	7.7	0.0	15.4	4.4	7.0
Laid off, Fired, Quit, etc.	24.4	25.6	19.2	14.1	10.3	2.7	3.8	26.4	9.3
Other	35.6	21.9	24.7	6.8	1.4	2.7	6.8	24.7	20.2
School Dropout	27.4	22.6	17.7	8.1	11.3	8.1	4.8	21.0	26.4
TOTAL	26.7%	24.1%	21.7%	9.1%	7.8%	3.0%	7.5%	99.9%	100.1%
(N)	(79)	(71)	(64)	(27)	(23)	(9)	(22)	(295)	(129)

TABLE D-14

REASONS GIVEN FOR TERMINATIONS OF VEPS ENROLLEES, BY
TYPE OF VEPS WORK EXPERIENCE

Reason for Termination	VEPS WORK EXPERIENCE							Never Worked	(N)	
	Prof.	Mngr.	Sales	Cler.	Craft.	Oper.	Labr.			Service
Other Private Sector Job	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	23.5%	5.9%	20.6%	20.6%	17.6%	0.0%	(34)
Involuntary Transfer to NYC	12.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	(8)
Pregnancy	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	(5)
Not Interested	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	7.7	23.1	15.4	15.4	15.4	(26)
Moved	0.0	0.0	6.7	46.7	0.0	13.3	6.7	13.3	13.3	(15)
Laid Off, Fired, Quit, etc.	1.3	0.0	17.9	17.9	10.3	10.3	14.1	28.2	0.0	(78)
Other	1.3	0.0	3.8	28.8	5.0	16.3	13.8	22.5	8.8	(80)
School Dropout	0.0	0.0	5.6	15.5	9.9	22.5	11.3	22.5	12.7	(71)
VEPS-II TOTAL	0.9%	0.0%	8.8%	23.0%	7.6%	17.0%	13.7%	22.1%	6.9%	(317)

TABLE D-15

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS DROPOUTS, BY CITY

Demographic Characteristics		Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
SEX	(N)	(14)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(9)	(71)	(42)
Male		71.4%	50.0%	75.0%	83.3%	--%	66.7%	--%	87.5%	40.0%	18.2%	66.7%	60.6%	66.7%
Female		28.6	50.0	25.0	16.7	--	33.3	--	12.5	60.0	81.8	33.3	39.4	33.3
AGE	(N)	(14)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(9)	(71)	(42)
15 or less		0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	--%	0.0%	--	0.0%	10.0%	9.1%	33.3%	11.3%	11.9%
16		57.1	0.0	25.0	50.0	--	33.3	--	12.5	30.0	54.5	55.6	40.8	61.9
17		35.7	50.0	37.5	33.3	--	66.7	--	62.5	30.0	9.1	11.1	32.4	23.8
18 or more		7.1	50.0	0.0	16.7	--	0.0	--	25.0	30.0	27.3	0.0	15.5	2.4
ETHNIC	(N)	(14)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(9)	(71)	(42)
Black		71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	--%	100.0%	--%	100.0%	0.0%	27.3%	11.1%	39.4%	45.2%
White		21.4	50.0	87.5	16.7	--	0.0	--	0.0	10.0	54.5	44.4	32.4	40.5
Spanish Sur- name		7.1	50.0	12.5	16.7	--	0.0	--	0.0	90.0	18.2	44.4	26.8	14.3
Other		0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	--	0.0	--	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
YEAR IN SCHOOL	(N)	(14)	(1)	(8)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(8)	(69)	(42)
Freshman		7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	--%	0.0%	--%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	4.8%
Sophomore		35.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	--	0.0	--	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	15.9	19.0
Junior		42.9	0.0	12.5	83.3	--	100.0	--	12.5	50.0	54.5	87.5	49.3	66.7
Senior		14.3	100.0	37.5	16.7	--	0.0	--	62.5	50.0	45.5	0.0	31.9	9.5

TABLE D-16

SELECTED FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS DROPOUTS, BY CITY

Family Characteristics	Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Flt.	Ft.W.	Geor.	Las V.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC.	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
HEAD OF HOUSE-													
<u>HOLD</u> (N)	(13)	(0)	(2)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(9)	(62)	(42)
Father	15.4%	--%	0.0%	33.3%	--%	33.3%	--%	25.0%	30.0%	45.5%	22.2%	25.8%	19.0%
Mother	61.5	--	100.0	33.3	--	33.3	--	62.5	40.0	27.3	66.7	53.2	69.0
Other	23.1	--	0.0	33.3	--	33.3	--	12.5	30.0	27.3	11.1	20.9	11.9
EMPLOYMENT OF													
<u>HEAD</u> (N)	(8)	(0)	(2)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(9)	(9)	(9)	(54)	(39)
Over 35 hours	0.0%	--%	100.0%	16.7%	--%	0.0%	--%	12.5%	33.3%	33.3%	55.6%	27.8%	28.2%
35 Hours or Less	12.5	--	0.0	33.3	--	33.3	--	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	5.1
Unemployed	87.5	--	0.0	50.0	--	66.7	--	75.0	66.7	55.6	44.4	61.1	66.7
CONTRIBUTES TO FAMILY													
<u>SUPPORT</u> (N)	(7)	(0)	(2)	(5)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(9)	(9)	(52)	(40)
Yes	14.3%	--%	50.0%	0.0%	--%	50.0%	--%	0.0%	50.0%	55.6%	66.7%	36.5%	32.5%
No	85.7	--	50.0	100.0	--	50.0	--	100.0	50.0	44.4	33.3	63.5	67.5
LIVES IN PUBLIC													
<u>HOUSING</u> (N)	(12)	(0)	(0)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(7)	(9)	(55)	(37)
Yes	16.7%	--%	--%	33.3%	--%	0.0%	--%	12.5%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.4%	27.0%
No	83.3	--	--	66.7	--	100.0	--	87.5	60.0	100.0	100.0	83.6	73.0
PUBLIC ASSIS-													
<u>TANCE</u> (N)	(12)	(2)	(7)	(6)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(9)	(65)	(41)
Yes	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	83.3%	--%	0.0%	--%	25.0%	100.0%	40.0%	77.8%	56.9%	63.4%
No	16.7	100.0	100.0	16.7	--	100.0	--	75.0	0.0	60.0	22.2	43.1	36.6

-170-

TABLE D-17

SELECTED EMPLOYMENT HISTORY CHARACTERISTICS OF VEPS DROPOUTS, BY CITY

Employment History		Clev.	Col.S.	Eug.	Ft.	Ft.W.	Geor.	LasV.	Pitt.	Pueb.	SLC	San B.	VEPS-II Total	VEPS-I Total
EVER WORKED	(N)	(7)	(0)	(6)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(8)	(9)	(57)	(39)
Yes		85.7%	--%	16.7%	83.3%	--%	100.0%	--%	75.0%	90.0%	62.5%	100.0%	77.2%	56.4%
No		14.3	--	83.3	16.7	--	0.0	--	25.0	10.0	37.5	0.0	22.8	43.6
CURRENTLY WORKING	(N)	(7)	(0)	(5)	(6)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(8)	(8)	(55)	(39)
Yes		28.6%	--%	0.0%	0.0%	--%	0.0%	--%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	10.2%
No		57.1	--	0.0	83.3	--	100.0	--	62.5	90.0	62.5	100.0	70.9	46.2
Never Worked		14.3	--	100.0	16.7	--	0.0	--	25.0	10.0	37.5	0.0	23.6	43.6
WORKED 30 DAYS OR MORE	(N)	(7)	(0)	(6)	(6)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(8)	(10)	(8)	(9)	(56)	(39)
Yes		57.1%	--%	16.7%	83.3%	--%	100.0%	--%	75.0%	80.0%	62.5%	88.9%	69.6%	51.3%
No		28.6	--	0.0	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0	10.0	0.0	11.1	7.1	5.1
Never Worked		14.3	--	83.3	16.7	--	0.0	--	25.0	10.0	37.5	0.0	23.2	43.6

APPENDIX E

NUMBER OF YOUTH ENGAGED IN VARIOUS WORK EXPERIENCES

Job Code	N	Title of Work Experience
001	1	Accountants
004	2	Computer Sytems Analyst
056	1	Personnel and Labor Relations
101	1	Recreation
151	2	Chemical Technician; Chemical Mixer Aide
184	1	Editor and Reporter; Advertisement Aide
191	1	Photographer; Cameraman Aide
265	1	Insurance Agent
280	93	Salesmen; Sales Clerk, Maintenance; Cashier; Marketing and Sales Aide; Rental Clerk; Retail Clerk; Clerk Trainee
301	1	Bankteller
305	9	Bookkeeper
310	24	Cashiers; Sales; Check out; Window Cashier; Clerical Cashier
311	7	Clerical Assistant; Social Welfare
314	4	Counter Clerk; Mail Order Clerk
323	2	Expeditors and Production Controller; Production Planning Aide; Material Inspector and Stocking
325	9	File Clerk; Medical Records Trainee; Filing
332	3	Mail Handlers
333	7	Messengers and Office Boys; Secretarial; Clerical Office Work; Mailroom
341	1	Bookkeeping and Billing Machine Operators; Proof Machine Operators
344	2	Duplicating Machine Operator
355	3	Office Machine Operator
361	1	Postal Clerk; Mail Warehouse Aide
364	12	Receptionists; Telephone Receptionist Clerk Typist
372	12	Secretaries; Receptionists
374	2	Shipping and Receiving Clerk
375	1	Statistical Clerk
381	13	Stock Clerks
382	3	Teacher's Aide
391	14	Typists
394	4	Miscellaneous Clerical Workers; Vault Safe Deposit, Credit Clerk
395	102	Not Specified Clerical Workers; Service Clerical Office Aide;; Clerical Aide; Customer Relations
402	4	Baker; Cook
405	2	Bookbinders; Bookbinder Aide
413	1	Cabinet Maker
415	4	Carpenter

Job Code	N	Title of Work Experience
420	1	Carpet Installer; Carpet Layout Aide
425	4	Decorators and Window Dressers; Floral Assistants; Loading and Arranging; Sales Display; Window Display
443	2	Furniture and Wood Finishers; Stainers and Trimmers
452	1	Inspectors; Presser Inspector
461	11	Machinist; Moldmakers; Mashing
470	1	Air Conditioning; Heating; Refrigeration
472	4	Auto Body Repair
473	5	Auto Mechanics
474	4	Auto Mechanic Apprentice
475	6	Data Processing Machine Operator; Shipping-Receiving Clerk
482	2	Miscellaneous Mechanics and Repairmen
510	2	Painting
542	1	Shoe Repair
543	1	Sign Painters and Letterers
551	2	Tailors
602	27	Assemblers
610	5	Checkers; Examiners; Inspectors
611	3	Clothing Ironers and Pressors; Cleaner, Pressing
615	1	Dry Wall Installers and Laborers
623	35	Garage Workers and Gas Station Attendants
630	1	Laundry and Dry Cleaning Operators
631	1	Meat Cutters; Butchers
640	1	Mine Operators
643	10	Packers, Wrappers
645	5	Photographic Process
662	1	Sawyer; Saw Operator
663	7	Sewers and Stitchers
664	1	Shoemaking Machine Operator
690	7	Machine Operator Miscellaneous
692	2	Machine Operator not Miscellaneous
694	55	Miscellaneous Operatives; Engineering; Printing Apprentice; Butcher's Aide; Baker's Aide; Craft Mechanic Aide; Shop Helper
695	2	Not Specified Operatives
705	2	Delivery and Routemen
711	4	Parking Attendant
750	2	Carpenter's Aide
751	2	Construction Helper
755	7	Gardeners and Groundskeepers
762	74	Stock Handlers; Stocking; Box Boy; Sales and Stock Clerk; Bagging; Delivery; Shipping
764	11	Vehicle Washers and Equipment Cleaners
770	9	Warehouseman
780	7	Miscellaneous Laborers
785	2	Not Specified Laborers
822	1	Farm Laborer
823	2	Farm Laborer; Unpaid Family; Ranch Management
902	5	Cleaners and Charwomen
903	21	Janitors and Sextons
901	1	Maid
911	7	Busboy; Counter Girl

Job Code	N	Title of Work Experience
912	8	Cooks
913	6	Dishwasher
914	4	Food Counter and Fountain Worker
915	28	Waiters and Waitresses
916	47	Food Service Workers
921	1	Dental Assistant
922	2	Health Aids (Except Nursing)
925	9	Nursing Aides, Orderlies and Attendants
926	2	Practical Nurses
933	3	Attendant; Personal Services
942	26	Child Care Workers
944	6	Hairdressers and Cosmetologists
981	3	Cooks; Private Household